

Asbury
Seminary Library

THE *Asbury Seminarian* ★ ★

Vol. I

No. 3

cap 5



Fall ❖ 1946

TRAINING A SPIRIT-FILLED MINISTRY

THE ASBURY SEMINARIAN

Published by
ASBURY THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY
Wilmore, Kentucky

EDITORIAL STAFF

Editor

HAROLD B. KUHN

ASSOCIATE EDITORS

GEORGE A. TURNER

C. ELVAN OLMSTEAD

JAMES D. ROBERTSON

Published in March, June, September, and December.

Publication and Editorial Offices: Asbury Theological Seminary, N. Lexington Avenue, Wilmore, Kentucky.

The subscription price is \$2.00 per annum.

Second class mailing permit applied for at the Post Office at Wilmore, Kentucky, April 6, 1946. Application pending.

Vol. I.

FALL 1946

No. 3

Table of Contents

	Page
The President's Letter	Julian C. McPheeters 81
Among Ourselves	82
Religious Education Under Fire (Guest Editorial)	B. Joseph Martin 83
The Church and the Crisis in Religion	Wilder R. Reynolds 86
Alumni Letter	Don A. Morris 95
The Date of the Exodus	Ralph M. Earle 96
Unity and Diversity in New Testament Theology	Harold B. Kuhn 105
Book Reviews	114

THE ASBURY SEMINARIAN

Published by
ASBURY THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY
Wilmore, Kentucky

EDITORIAL STAFF

Editor

HAROLD B. KUHN

ASSOCIATE EDITORS

GEORGE A. TURNER

C. ELVAN OLMSTEAD

JAMES D. ROBERTSON

Published in March, June, September, and December.

Publication and Editorial Offices: Asbury Theological Seminary, N. Lexington Avenue, Wilmore, Kentucky.

The subscription price is \$2.00 per annum.

Second class mailing permit applied for at the Post Office at Wilmore, Kentucky, April 6, 1946. Application pending.

Vol. I FALL 1946 No. 3

Table of Contents

	Page
The President's Letter	Julian C. McPheeters 81
Among Ourselves	82
Religious Education Under Fire (Guest Editorial)	B. Joseph Martin 83
The Church and the Crisis in Religion	Wilder R. Reynolds 86
Alumni Letter	Don A. Morris 95
The Date of the Exodus	Ralph M. Earle 96
Unity and Diversity in New Testament Theology	Harold B. Kuhn 105
Book Reviews	114

The President's Letter

JULIAN C. MCPHEETERS

Asbury Theological Seminary opened her doors for the fall quarter on September 18th. The summer months were filled with activities in preparation for the fall opening. It was perhaps the busiest summer in the history of the Seminary.

Our new business manager, Mr. Earl Savage, assumed his duties in July. He, in cooperation with the Vice-President, Dr. B. Joseph Martin, supervises the many activities now involved in our building program in the erection of four new buildings: the Morrison Memorial Administration Building, the Estes Chapel, the Library Building, and the "Betty Morrison" memorial apartment house building for married students.

In addition to the supervision of the many activities entailed with the construction of these buildings there has been the work in connection with the erection of twenty Government units for G. I. men. Several dwelling houses have been remodeled into apartments for married students.

The big problem with which we were confronted during the entire summer was the question of housing facilities for the steadily increasing number of new students applying for admission at the opening of the fall quarter. Before mid-summer it was evident that we would need housing for a hundred more students than we have room to accommodate. This situation makes doubly imperative the pushing of our building program for more room.

The June commencement was a red letter day in the history of the Seminary. There were thirty B.D. graduates in the graduating class, the largest in the history of the institution. The commencement offering for the "Betty Morrison" Memorial Building exceeded \$31,000. The total of the new gifts announced at commencement exceeded \$130,000.

The new organization of the Alumni Association was effected at commencement with Dr. R. P. Shuler, pastor of the Trinity Methodist Church of Los Angeles, delivering the alumni address. Dr. Shuler also delivered the Baccalaureate sermon. Rev. Don Morris, pastor of the First Methodist Church at Saginaw, Michigan, was elected president of the Alumni Association. Dean F. H. Larabee, who had been dean of the Seminary since 1924, retired as dean at the June commencement and was elected Dean Emeritus. Dr. William D. Turkington, professor of New Testament in the Seminary, was elected as dean to succeed Dr. Larabee. Dr. B. Joseph Martin, professor of Christian Education, was elected Vice-President of the Seminary. Dr. Larabee continues in a teaching capacity on the faculty in the field of New Testament Greek. Mr. T. Delos Crary was elected treasurer of the Seminary to succeed Mr. J. H. Prichard who found it necessary to resign on account of his heavy duties in connection with the *Pentecostal Herald*.

(Concluded on page 104)

Among Ourselves

JULIAN C. McPHEETERS, LL.D., is president of Asbury Theological Seminary. He is also widely known as a Christian journalist, and is prominent in Evangelical circles.

B. JOSEPH MARTIN (Ph.D., University of Southern California) is vice-president of Asbury Theological Seminary, and head of the department of Christian education.

WILDER R. REYNOLDS (Ph.D., University of Cincinnati), is head of the department of church history in Asbury Theological Seminary. He was for sixteen years chairman of the department of history in Asbury College. Dr. Reynolds is associate editor of this periodical.

DON A. MORRIS (A.B., Asbury College; B.D., Asbury Theological Seminary), is pastor of First Methodist Church in Saginaw, Michigan, and president of the Alumni Association of the Seminary.

RALPH M. EARLE is professor of Biblical literature in Nazarene Theological Seminary. An alumnus of Eastern Nazarene College, Dr. Earle holds the degrees of A.M. from Boston University, and of B.D. and Th.D. from Gordon Divinity School.

HAROLD B. KUHN (Ph.D., Harvard University) is professor of philosophy of religion in Asbury Theological Seminary, and editor of this periodical.

DELBERT R. ROSE (A.B., John Fletcher College; M.A., University of Iowa) was for six years professor of Bible and religion in Kletzing College. He is at present engaged in doctoral studies in Union Theological Seminary.

EDGAR S. BRIGHTMAN (Ph.D., Boston University) is Borden Parker Bowne professor of philosophy in Boston University. His reply is addressed to a review by John H. Gerstner, published in the summer issue.

LENA B. NOFCIER (B.S. in Library Service, University of Illinois), is librarian of Asbury Theological Seminary.

JESSE DEBOER (Ph.D., Harvard University), is assistant professor of philosophy, University of Kentucky in Lexington.

Guest Editorial--

Religious Education Under Fire

B. JOSEPH MARTIN

The first two decades of the present century saw the emergence of religious education as one of the major movements of American Protestantism. After World War I, the idea of a "teaching church" swept the country. The Boston University School of Religious Education enrollment increased from 105 in 1918 to 607 in 1928. Departments of religious education have been organized in nearly all the major denominations. Colleges, universities and seminaries have added departments of religious education. Like most things American, Protestantism organized itself for religious education work in a big way.

Like every other complex movement, this educational awakening of the church was the result of many different factors. Among those factors must be included new developments in sociology, psychology, educational philosophy; the critical historical methods employed in the study of the Bible; the dominance of the scientific method in religion; and the evolutionary view of life and God. A complete analysis reveals the facts that it was also the fruit of a new mode of religious life and thought. This new outlook is usually called liberal Christianity—a movement which seeks nothing short of a complete reconstruction of Christianity.

That a discontent with traditional Christianity ensued is readily evident to those who have "ears to hear, and eyes to see." In 1913, J. T. Shotwell opened a series of lectures with these words: "We are in the midst of a reli-

gious revolution! The old regime of immemorial belief and custom is vanishing before our eyes. Faiths so old that they come to us from the prehistoric world are yielding to the discoveries of yesterday." Charles A. Ellwood stated in 1923: "Like all other institutions, religion is in a revolution." J. Gresham Machen felt the elements of change in the religious world, which change he deplored. "... the present time is a time of conflict. The great redemptive religion which has always been known as Christianity is battling against a totally diverse type of religious belief, which is only the more destructive of the Christian faith because it makes use of traditional Christian terminology." An objective observation reveals the tendency in American liberal theology to use many traditional terms, but with new meaning. The terms "salvation," "sin," "redemption," and "regeneration" have a different content for liberal and evangelical Christianity.

Liberalism is a new type of Christianity. As such it has some definite pronouncements and a distinctive position on: the Bible, the religious life, creed, worship, man, and Jesus Christ.

The Bible is viewed as the product of a social process which negates revelation. The method of Biblical study, for liberalism, is that of a critical historical approach and it accepts without equivocation (in the classroom, if not in the pulpit) the results of scientific enquiry. Thus, the Bible loses its authoritative voice and is not viewed

Among Ourselves

JULIAN C. McPHEETERS, LL.D., is president of Asbury Theological Seminary. He is also widely known as a Christian journalist, and is prominent in Evangelical circles.

B. JOSEPH MARTIN (Ph.D., University of Southern California) is vice-president of Asbury Theological Seminary, and head of the department of Christian education.

WILDER R. REYNOLDS (Ph.D., University of Cincinnati), is head of the department of church history in Asbury Theological Seminary. He was for sixteen years chairman of the department of history in Asbury College. Dr. Reynolds is associate editor of this periodical.

DON A. MORRIS (A.B., Asbury College; B.D., Asbury Theological Seminary), is pastor of First Methodist Church in Saginaw, Michigan, and president of the Alumni Association of the Seminary.

RALPH M. EARLE is professor of Biblical literature in Nazarene Theological Seminary. An alumnus of Eastern Nazarene College, Dr. Earle holds the degrees of A.M. from Boston University, and of B.D. and Th.D. from Gordon Divinity School.

HAROLD B. KUHN (Ph.D., Harvard University) is professor of philosophy of religion in Asbury Theological Seminary, and editor of this periodical.

DELBERT R. ROSE (A.B., John Fletcher College; M.A., University of Iowa) was for six years professor of Bible and religion in Kletzing College. He is at present engaged in doctoral studies in Union Theological Seminary.

EDGAR S. BRIGHTMAN (Ph.D., Boston University) is Borden Parker Bowne professor of philosophy in Boston University. His reply is addressed to a review by John H. Gerstner, published in the summer issue.

LENA B. NOFCIER (B.S. in Library Service, University of Illinois), is librarian of Asbury Theological Seminary.

JESSE DEBOER (Ph.D., Harvard University), is assistant professor of philosophy, University of Kentucky in Lexington.

Guest Editorial --

Religious Education Under Fire

B. JOSEPH MARTIN

The first two decades of the present century saw the emergence of religious education as one of the major movements of American Protestantism. After World War I, the idea of a "teaching church" swept the country. The Boston University School of Religious Education enrollment increased from 105 in 1918 to 607 in 1928. Departments of religious education have been organized in nearly all the major denominations. Colleges, universities and seminaries have added departments of religious education. Like most things American, Protestantism organized itself for religious education work in a big way.

Like every other complex movement, this educational awakening of the church was the result of many different factors. Among those factors must be included new developments in sociology, psychology, educational philosophy; the critical historical methods employed in the study of the Bible; the dominance of the scientific method in religion; and the evolutionary view of life and God. A complete analysis reveals the facts that it was also the fruit of a new mode of religious life and thought. This new outlook is usually called liberal Christianity—a movement which seeks nothing short of a complete reconstruction of Christianity.

That a discontent with traditional Christianity ensued is readily evident to those who have "ears to hear, and eyes to see." In 1913, J. T. Shotwell opened a series of lectures with these words: "We are in the midst of a reli-

gious revolution! The old regime of immemorial belief and custom is vanishing before our eyes. Faiths so old that they come to us from the prehistoric world are yielding to the discoveries of yesterday." Charles A. Ellwood stated in 1923: "Like all other institutions, religion is in a revolution." J. Gresham Machen felt the elements of change in the religious world, which change he deplored. "... the present time is a time of conflict. The great redemptive religion which has always been known as Christianity is battling against a totally diverse type of religious belief, which is only the more destructive of the Christian faith because it makes use of traditional Christian terminology." An objective observation reveals the tendency in American liberal theology to use many traditional terms, but with new meaning. The terms "salvation," "sin," "redemption," and "regeneration" have a different content for liberal and evangelical Christianity.

Liberalism is a new type of Christianity. As such it has some definite pronouncements and a distinctive position on: the Bible, the religious life, creed, worship, man, and Jesus Christ.

The Bible is viewed as the product of a social process which negates revelation. The method of Biblical study, for liberalism, is that of a critical historical approach and it accepts without equivocation (in the classroom, if not in the pulpit) the results of scientific enquiry. Thus, the Bible loses its authoritative voice and is not viewed

by liberals as the Word of God. This explains why so much of the church school literature is non-biblical.

The religious life is viewed in terms of a growth process. The "growth" concept in religious education was largely the result of one man, Horace Bushnell. In the middle of the 19th century Bushnell wrote his book, *Christian Nurture*, in which he sternly criticized the practice of revivalistic churches in their insistence upon a conscious emotional experience, and maintained "that the child is to grow up a Christian and never know himself as otherwise." This book was the strong influence which turned the attention of the churches away from an emphasis on evangelical conversion to a growth emphasis. Here lies one of the main causes for the alarming decline in church school attendance during the past few years. Liberal religious education stands condemned in the presence of its failure to convert its pupils!

Liberalism is in its essential nature a progressive movement, always changing, always in flux; its conclusions are never fixed or static; it has no unalterable "deposit of faith" to teach. It does not desire uniformity of opinion. The religious life is viewed largely as a social interpretation rather than metaphysical. The interest is directed more in social welfare than in "saving souls." There is a labored effort at maintaining a minimum of absolutes and a conscious effort to promulgate a maximum tentativeness. The lack of any supernaturalism is conspicuous. For the liberal religious educator, the center of interest is elsewhere. Hence, religious teachers have seen more clearly what *not* to do than *what* to teach or *how* to teach. Most liberal exponents have been so preoccupied with ultimate aims of a redeemed social order, that they have failed to concern themselves with some immediate objectives, namely, provid-

ing the learner with spiritual capital with which to do spiritual business. Liberal religious educators have justly earned the criticism of failing to give the children of the church schools an adequate Christian faith.

Although it is not so prevalent as it once was among liberal adherents, it is still true that for liberal religious educators, creed is relegated to a subordinate position, if not to the dark ages! The interest is directed toward an inquiry into the "life of Jesus." In failing to properly indoctrinate the learner, liberal religious education has made possible the onslaught in its ranks of the sect-type churches, Roman Catholicism and the esoteric religion of Christian Science. It is a tragic fact that in the period when the major Protestant churches lost the most members, the above named groups increased in membership. Again, liberal religious education stands condemned for its tragic failure to perpetuate historic evangelical truths.

No idea of evangelical faith was more offensive to the 19th century liberals than the idea of human depravity. Of course, the idea of the sinfulness of man was totally incompatible with Bushnell's goodness of man. The predominant emphasis was "a sunny view of man." The basic element in Channing's theology is the doctrine of man's inherent divinity. In his discourse, "Likeness to God," 1828, he states: "In Christianity I meet perpetual testimonies to the divinity of human nature." Since man has within him the seeds of divinity, all he needs to do is unfold, develop and grow more like God. The mere mentioning of names such as Niebuhr, Barth and Lewis is sufficient to show that something of significant importance is happening in regard to the refutation of the "goodness of man" concept. This is but one of the many resurgences in America of basic theological concepts

that most liberals supposed they had left behind for good.

Liberalism has Jesus Christ on its hands, and it doesn't know what to do with him. But make up its mind it must and will! And when liberalism has made up its mind about a Christology, it is duty bound to express its statements in language that the man of the street will clearly understand and not be fooled. Liberal religious education will have to choose to have its mind made up at this point by a Channing, a Bushnell, a Parker, and a Fosdick, or by a St. Paul, a Luther, and a Wesley. And in that choice lies the doom or the glory of religious education.

The premise with which Protestant liberals have sought to interpret the nature of Jesus is very different from that of earlier Christian thinkers. Dr. Fosdick in his book, *The Modern Use of the Bible*, states this contrast clearly. "They started with the certainty that Jesus came from the divine realm and then wondered how he could be truly man; we start from the certainty that he was genuinely man and then wonder in what sense he can be God." It is in this reversal of certainty that liberal theologians cut the nerve center of a dynamic historic Christology. In other words, the real Jesus for liberalism is a twentieth century modernist! Liberal religious education stands condemned for its failure to give to the Protestant church schools a virile, all-saving, atoning Christ. The sand is fast running out of the glass of time and reli-

gious educators had better hurry up and answer this question in plain, simple words: "Is Jesus Son of God or is He a mere child of his culture?" In that answer lies much of the destiny of religious education. Sometime or another, the cleavage with Unitarianism will have to be made.

We are facing what is believed by many to be the most serious crisis that Christianity has had to confront. Much of contemporary American life is characterized by educated heathenism and cultured paganism. Ours is a heathenism, not of the jungles, but of college and university campus. Ours is a paganism, not of backward peoples, but of smartness and with a veneer of culture. Modern America sins with finesse and refuses to admit that he sins. Our age pursues its evil ways with an Emily Post finesse. Add to this the overwhelming social issues precipitated by modern industrialism and one need not be a prophet to predict that sweeping, radical changes must occur within the thought life and objectives of liberal Protestantism, or else Christianity will be relegated to a subordinate status within western civilization. Whether we will have two types of Christianity—liberal and evangelical—or one type, is no longer a debate taking place in classrooms only. The issue is very definite and so important that it is argued in the presence of the laity. And herein lies the optimistic belief that evangelical Christianity will win in the contest.

The Church and The Crisis In Religion*

WILDER R. REYNOLDS

Nearly two thousand years ago when the destinies of the infant Church seemed to be at a very low ebb, Christ uttered a prophecy which for sheer audacity is perhaps unmatched in all literature. By any pragmatic test, the future of the Church at that time was very unpromising. And yet in its darkest hour Christ spoke the words of the text, "I will build my Church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it. And I will give thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven." Matt. 16:18-19. Twenty centuries have passed, and here it is, the most vital, persistent and dynamic force in the world. Through the vicissitudes of the centuries it has endured, ever transforming the crude, intractable milieu of the world into steadily improving patterns of practical expression and idealistic conception.

Today, I want you to think about this divinely commissioned institution, the Church. I shall discuss its nature, its place in history, and the present crisis in which it finds itself. In so doing I hope to make clear the part we ought to play as individuals and as an institution in the present, confusing scheme of things.

I

THE NATURE OF THE CHURCH

The New Testament term for the Church is *Ekklesia*, which means a

called-out assembly of men. The word is used 111 times in the New Testament. The term has at least four uses or applications: 1. the universal Church formed of regenerated persons vitally united to Christ; 2. the local church; 3. a group of churches; and 4. the visible church without reference to locality or number.

It is the larger and more comprehensive meaning of the Church which will occupy us here. By this I mean the concept of the Church as the whole body of the redeemed in this age. This implies not an organization but an organism. It is the "body of Christ," a distinct "mystery," according to Ephesians 3:1-11, the unfolding of which was committed to the Apostle Paul. This universal, redeemed brotherhood of man is mentioned three times in the Gospels, nineteen times in the Acts, and sixty-two times in Paul's epistles.

This Church, "which is His body," is revealed in its varied relationships and missions. It is a part of the Kingdom of God, but not the whole of it; for the Kingdom includes all moral intelligences in every age and sphere which are subject to the divine authority. Corporately, it is "His body, the fullness of Him that fills all in all." The body is for service and manifestation; and so this Church is charged with the marvelous privilege of making Him visible to men.

The text reveals the two-fold function of its nature and office. The Lord's confession concerning His Church, "Upon this rock I will build my Church," was made in answer to Peter's confession that he was the

*This is the text of an inaugural dissertation delivered upon the occasion of Dr. W. R. Reynolds' installation as professor of church history in Asbury Theological Seminary, held at a convocation in Wilmore, Kentucky on Thursday, October 17, 1946.

Messiah. "Thou art the Messiah" is the eternal fact upon which the Church must forever rest. Emil Brunner is exactly right in his great book, *The Messiah*, in making the messiahship of Jesus the central fact in the entire moral universe.

The function of the Church is implied in these challenging words: "The gates of hell shall not prevail against it." This reveals the nature of the Church as a conquering army, leading an exodus out of all bondage, even death. The figure is that of an army marching forth to war. The conflict is against the opposing forces of evil in our world. Christ's description of His Church is that of a glorious, militant, aggressive, victorious host that storms the very gates of hell, and wins. The Church in our day, when measured by this standard, seems to leave something to be desired. It looks more like a force that has been routed and has sought shelter within its citadel. It seems to be fighting a defensive battle rather weakly. To this extent it violates its own nature and betrays the confidence of its head and Lord.

"I will give thee the keys of the Kingdom." This speaks of the office of the Church as the repository of a true, a moral, authority. It is entrusted with responsibility concerning the ethic of heaven for the government of earth. Therefore, its witness should be clear, positive, and uncompromising. The present weak, confused, vacillating attitude does not comport with the high, divine destiny of the Church of Christ.

A very exalted view of the nature of the Church is set forth in Ferré's recent book, *The Return to Christianity*.¹ He develops the thesis that the Church is the "Kingdom of God on earth"; "it is the extension of the Atonement"; it is "the embodiment in

history of the Holy Spirit"; and it is "the end for which God made the world." He is definite and specific concerning the Church's relation to the world; yet he is very positive in asserting that "the first function of the Church, nevertheless, is making God known and effective in the hearts of men." Incidental to this is the obligation of the Church "to condemn all evil," "to offer forgiveness, pardon, and healing to confused and weary men, and to indoctrinate its members, especially the young, not only with the faith that in saving gives steadiness and creativity to human lives, but also with the ideals of a Christian society and a Christian world."

This view would seem to hold the individualistic and the social aspects of the Gospel in proper balance. It is in line with the great declaration of Christ in Mark 12:30-31: "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind, and with all thy strength—and—Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself." It is needless to remark that the Church of the past has been chiefly concerned with the piety of the law (relationship to God), but now the morality of the law (relationship to man) is receiving great consideration. That is well; for we cannot be God's children without sharing God's concern for the world. In short, the Church is one of the redemptive agencies of God in the world.

II

THE CHURCH IN HISTORY

The Church has proven to be the most adaptable, the most resilient, the most tenacious and the most aggressive institution in the history of western Europe during the past two thousand years. Its conquest of the Roman Empire in three or four centuries is one of the greatest exploits in all history. Without a king, army, captain

¹Nels F. S. Ferré, *Return to Christianity*, p. 41ff.

or sword it went forth to conquer by force of ideas alone.

I know it is the fashion to condemn the Church of the past as an obscurantist, reactionary impediment in the march to progress. It is popular to condemn it as the foe of every man of science who dared to suffer for the truth. It has been charged with fomenting and waging unholy wars, of supporting corrupt political systems, and of defending iniquitous social and economic systems.

Now one wonders just what theologies and creeds these critics have been reading. So far as I am able to discover, no church of the past or present has ever made a creedal statement on political theory, economics, social theory or natural science. Not even evolutionism, which is admittedly revolutionary and disruptive of faith, has evoked official dogmatic or creedal statements from most of the churches. Nor has any Church, excepting the Quakers, Mennonites, Brethren and a few others, made a creedal statement on such a burning issue as the nature of war.

We are ready to admit that there have been men in the Church who did all the things these critics charge. But very often they were the immoral, simoniacal politicians and demagogues who have been sharply condemned by the spiritual men in every age. So far as my information goes, Roger Bacon, Galileo, Kepler, Copernicus, Newton, Darwin, Millikin and Jeans have been sons and, for the most part, loyal members of the Church. Why not recognize these as valid representatives of the Church as well as the corrupt politicians who might have dominated its machinery? I prefer to believe that the true Church has always been abreast of the intellectual advance, if not in a leading position. It has been foremost in the conquest of truth, and the material forces of each age; yet the symbol of her unity as the seal of

her conquest is the abiding Christ in the human heart, in human life, and in human society.

No, I cannot accept the pessimistic view that the Church has been a stumbling-block in the path of progress. I am sure the story of history will not sustain that thesis. History will tell us that idolatry and bloody sacrifices perished from the vast domain conquered by Christianity, and the nameless vice disappeared with heathenism. It will tell us that marriage received a new sanction and sacredness, the home a purity, and woman a position of honor before unknown when the Church triumphed in the world. History will tell of the introduction of a thousand philanthropies unknown in a heathen world. Mercy came into public law and civil society through the Church. Children, widows, orphans, slaves, prisoners, the sick and the maimed, the wretched debtor and the outcast, were to know a new compassion and sympathy when the Church won.

Let us not disparage the role of the Church in our civilization. What we call modern life and modern civilization rests definitely upon it. The conversion and training of the Germanic peoples, the builders of this western culture, was the work of the Church. Through it were mediated the arts and culture of the ancient world. Our civilization does not draw its principles, or methods, or inspiration from heathen sources, whether of the orient, or Greece, or Rome; nor from Mohammedanism, infidelity, or atheism, but from western Christianity. Our democracy is solidly based on the idealism of the Sermon on the Mount and the Golden Rule, which has been fostered by the Church. When that idealism goes, democracy will become untenable and we will have the "man on horseback."

It requires only superficial insight to see that redeemed men who have

become the sons of God have been the "salt of the earth" in every generation. It is certainly becoming increasingly apparent that it is folly to expect deliverance from the menace of the impending crisis of this hour from United Nations Organizations, Security Councils, communistic milleniums or penny-wise" politicians. Our hope must be in the Christ of history. He said, "I will build my Church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it." That glorious destiny divinely foretold has not yet been realized. Our help must now come from this source, or it will not come at all. It is preposterous to look to God-denying, Christ-rejecting political, economic or social systems to save us.

III

THE PRESENT CRISIS

Within the past one hundred years a revolution profound and far-reaching has precipitated the greatest crisis in the history of the Church. This revolution has challenged the very fundamentals of the Faith. The Protestant Reformation had gone deep, but the identities between Protestants and Catholics were deeper still. The world of Luther was not materially different in its basic conceptions from the world of Athanasius and Augustine; and the world of Jonathan Edwards was substantially the same as Calvin's. That is to say, western civilization was essentially Christian in outlook.

The point of departure for the forces which have so greatly modified the modern outlook may be taken as the year of the publication of Darwin's *Origin of Species*, 1859. This achievement suggested the formula by which science and history have been restated; and the physicists, chemists, biologists and psychologists have been quick to relate their theories to the new viewpoint.

Among others who contributed to

the revolution the following may be named: James Hutton, in his *Theory of the Earth*, was the first to question the Genesis cosmology. Lyell, in his *Principles of Geology*, attempted to show how the earth was molded; he also developed the theory of the sequence of fossils, and he formulated the doctrine of Uniformitarianism in place of the doctrine of Catastrophism as taught in the Bible. Herbert Spencer developed a cismic evolutionism by advocating a general evolutionary system in all branches of human thought. Laplace produced the Nebular Hypothesis which enabled the scientists to discard neatly the doctrine of Creationism. The results were so startling that William James was led to observe at the turn of this century that a revolution had occurred in a single generation which was so profound and transforming that the old truths, which had spoken so savingly and livingly to our fathers, now seemed as strange and outlandish as if they had come from another planet.

This revolution along with the scientific front was paralleled by the rise of the "Higher Criticism" on the biblical front which produced a further reaction upon faith and caused the average man to lose his bearings. On the psychological and philosophical fronts, materialism influenced the attitude of multitudes, and Pragmatism, with its relativism in ethics and morals, destroyed the faith of men in the finality of Christ and Christian truth.

The upshot of all these profoundly disturbing theories has been to plunge us into an age of confusion. Science, Biblical criticism, psychology and philosophy have all had their share in making people impatient with the inherited systems of belief, or doubtful or defiant of them. Dean Inge has described the situation thus, "The Industrial Revolution has generated a new type of barbarism, with no roots

in the past. An unnatural and unhealthy mentality has been developed, whose chief characteristic is a profound secularity and materialism. Men are impatient of discipline, scornful of old methods, contemptuous of experience, and unwilling to pay the price of the best."

This scientific revolution produced a serious rift within the organized Church itself. The modernist-fundamentalist split is familiar enough to all. The present state of that problem is cogently analyzed by Dean Willard L. Sperry in his recent book, *Religion in America*. He finds our theological world sharply divided, with our most vocal and assertive leaders ranged either at the humanistic left or the neo-orthodox right. Between these extremes he sees a great middle group which is without effective spokesmen and candidly perplexed and inarticulate.

The Dean describes the theological left as "a group of resolute persons who are convinced that we should accept the full logic of our liberalism over the last century and a half, and go on to an unashamed humanism."² He also points out the crisis among the liberals. He says many of them are "tired of the summons to self reliance." They are looking for some spiritual and moral power not themselves to which they may give themselves. They find it increasingly difficult to hold the blandly cheerful view of human nature which was once the fashion. Even Bishop McConnell, writing in the Church School Magazine at the time of Pearl Harbor, said flatly that we have been too optimistic in our view of human nature. We have refused to recognize that there is something demonic in human nature, which thing was then finding expression in German and Japanese atrocities. Although he would not go back to

the orthodox doctrine of original sin, his inference was that we must develop a modern equivalent of that doctrine. Walter Lippman expressed the very same ideas in his column at the same time.

At the theological right is neo-orthodoxy, headed by Karl Barth. This movement advocates return to the theology of the Reformers; as such, it is crypto-Calvinistic to say the least. From our local viewpoint, it over-emphasizes the divine sovereignty at the expense of human responsibility, and it unduly disparages human nature. But it is the most challenging movement on the theological horizon at the moment, and it definitely spearheads an international theological advance in the direction of an evangelical Christianity.

There are also evidences that the theological right is at a cross-roads—it has its crisis. An editorial in United Evangelical Action for August 15, 1946, is an arresting article. Editor Murch tells of a meeting of young evangelical scholars in a conference "with the express purpose of discovering the weaknesses of evangelicals and possible ways and means of overcoming them." He says these young evangelicals discovered that there are two kinds of evangelicals. One group crystallized and solidified its creed and practice at the 1880 level, the time when liberalism began to make great inroads upon the Church. The other group seeks to be modern without being modernists. These are not afraid of an intellectual approach to the problems of our day.

Editor Murch gives us this soul-searching criticism, and, since he is talking about his own family, his criticism must be regarded as purely constructive:

Even in evangelism, the pride and joy of fundamentalism, there is a serious lack. Evangelists of this type place a premium on ignorance. Their sermons are so lacking in intellectual content that they fail completely to challenge thinking

² Willard L. Sperry: *Religion In America*, p. 155.

people. These sermons are aimed at the emotions, not the mind. They consist of jargon so stereotyped that when these evangelists hear a thinking evangelist preaching New Testament doctrine in our modern-day English language they suspect that he is a modernist. . . . It is small wonder, under this type of evangelism, that thousands are lost as soon as the wave of emotion has passed.

He points out that too often these churches are a thing apart from the community.

There is little personal witness or testimony as to the position of the church in the world, little discussion between individuals concerning the bases of Christian behavior. Sometimes the avoidance of lipstick, bobbed hair, wearing of jewelry, lodges or movies marks the church members from others in the community, yet these same people may be guilty of sins of hypocrisy, bigotry and a Pharisaism far more serious in the eye of God and man.

IV

A CHALLENGE

In the stirring book previously referred to, *Return to Christianity* by Ferré, the author sweepingly indicts science, traditional theology and modernism.³ He calls them all "cracked bells." Our task," he says, "is to melt down these cracked bells and to forge a Christian bell that will ring true enough to be convincing and loud enough to be heard." He proceeds to show in vigorous detail how and why these bells have cracked.

Science is the bell to which this age has listened most intently. It revolutionized our world by making it richer and more comfortable and by forging new and sharper weapons of truth. But it failed because it became materialistic. It has nothing to say about ultimate reality. It has chosen to delimit its sphere to the purely physical-historical world. Men are beginning now to understand that its naturalistic metaphysics is not scientific. By leaving out all moral purpose, science has failed, even practically. In the brightest day of scientific achievement civilization has been more broadly and deeply threatened than ever before.

Traditional theology has failed, according to the author, "because, instead of believing in the power of God's love (as shown in the life, teachings and death of Jesus Christ) to transform both man and society, it merely projected actuality as it now is, with its good and bad, into an intensified eternal dimension."³ The result has been to lower the demands on conduct, particularly on that of society, almost to the point of the prevailing conventional standards. Too often it became allied with the status quo of the world, compromised its spirit and message, and failed in its true mission as the herald of a daring prophetic power for the transformation of all the relationships of men.

Modernism failed because its standards were not primarily religious. It claimed to be a religion, but its standards were those of positivistic science. It became overly intellectualistic, whereas faith appeals to the will and to the emotions. "Although its Christian sensitivity gave it a social concern, it tended to lose both religious and social force because it was all the while blind to the fact that an adequate religion must have its source, standard, and dynamics in a power primarily not of this world." His general conclusion is that traditional theology, while it is very religious, failed because it was not Christian enough; and modernism, while it was basically Christian in thought, failed because it was not religious enough. One gets the idea that the ideal type of Christian would be a modernist imbued with the ardor and zeal of a fundamentalist evangelist. Up to now those two things have seemed to be mutually exclusive.

Dr. Ferré is severe and caustic in his criticism of things as they now are. And well he might be. But his criticism is not merely negative; it is to a very purposeful end. He goes on

³ Ferré, *op cit.*, pp. 2ff

to expound his views as to what real Christianity is and how it should perform. He defines true Christianity as *agape* (Christian love). To those who are familiar with Wesley's teachings on perfect love, the author's exposition has a very familiar ring. But for loftiness of ideal and exalted standard of conduct there is nothing in holiness literature which surpasses it.

A few quotations will suffice to show the author's general view. It is to be observed that he is dealing with the positive, objective aspects of Christian love, whereas the Wesleyan school has, perhaps, been more concerned with the negative, subjective aspects.

Christian *Agape* is complete, self-giving concern for others.

In such community all selfishness is gone; all indifference is gone; all ignorance which springs from individual and social inertia—is gone.

In it there is no suspicion, no envy, no evil imagination of the heart.

The individual finds himself in a friendly, appreciative, helpful fellowship, which brings out the best in him in terms of growth, creativity, and spontaneity, for in the finding of this fellowship he has also found his deepest self.

The will to live has become a will to love; the will to power, a will to fellowship; the will to superiority, a will to service; the will to social recognition, a will to social responsibility and concern.

In *Agape*, man wants to be used by God, his heart overflows with gratitude and joy for what God is for the whole world, and he longs to serve his fellowmen better and to become a better member of the Christian fellowship.

Live religion lives by worship, by prayer, by fellowship, by obedience, by service, by personal vision, by walking with God.

Radical Christianity is needed 'that unmistakably shows the signs of the Spirit, that is so vital, that has such insight, power, concern, wisdom, and victorious enthusiasm, that it shows, in short, such adequacy of spirit that men will own the source because they cannot deny the effects.'

We cannot be God's children without sharing

God's concern for the world.

Christian *Agape* is never fanatical, never merely tolerant, and never in the slightest sense negative.

Christian *Agape* always strives for the truth, but is always humble, never quarreling, never offensive, never domineering, never defensive.

We need men whose will to live has been freed from the will to power, to success, to superiority, to social recognition, to possession, and to pretense.

We must have indispensably a new, sweeping Christian revival which is bigger than the old conversionism and deeper than the old social gospelism.

There must also come a new prophetic preaching deeply rooted in the Christian Gospel which will show the Church and the world what Christianity really is.⁴

V

A LOCAL APPLICATION

No one can read the author's moving evangel without being deeply stirred. Here is a standard that is higher in some respects than Wesley set. As followers of Wesley, we are in sympathetic accord with the author's earnest appeal, and in my opinion we are in a position to do something about it. To put it in a hackneyed American phrase, "We are in a scoring position."

The question may be raised, "Is the ideal of Christian character and conduct herein delineated too lofty?" May it be that the author is pleading for something which our fathers described as Adamic perfection and which is unattainable in this life by poor, ignorant, deranged, fallen mortals? The complaisant thing, perhaps the instinctive act of self-defense, might be to dismiss the whole thing as the impractical dream of a visionary. In all probability the rational thing to do is to accept the challenge of it and make a supreme effort to do something about it.

⁴ Ferré, *op. cit.*, 17ff.

If the author's standard may perchance be out of our reach, may it not be true that we have been content to live by a standard that is indefensibly low. Perhaps we have been too ready to say that perfect love is a thing purely subjective, that it is a matter solely of motives, purposes and intentions; and that action, performance and conduct can never be brought into line because of infirmities and the weakness of the flesh. This excuses a lot of miserably poor living on the basis that our hearts may be pure and holy but our heads are uneducated and unlightened, therefore there must always be a disparate lag between purpose and performance.

It is indeed heartening to hear men from a totally different theological climate from ours begin to emphasize the things in which we have been traditionally interested. I have quoted largely from Sperry and Ferré, not because they have introduced something new and unheard of, but because they are speaking a language that has long been familiar to us. It should stir us to greater diligence in our efforts to more fully comprehend the great truths to which we stand committed and to increase our energy to more effectually make them known to others.

It has been shown that the major theological camps are in crisis. Perhaps it may not be amiss to say that the cause of Wesleyan perfectionism is also at the cross-roads. It is this writer's opinion that the teaching on this great doctrine was largely crystallized and stereotyped by Ralston's *Elements of Divinity*, a magnificent work in Biblical Theology, three generations ago. Most of the literature which has appeared on the subject since has been purely inspirational and hortatory, and of the proof-text variety of exposition.

Needless to say, great disturbing problems in science, philosophy and

psychology have emerged of which neither Wesley, nor Watson, nor Ralston ever dreamed. The need is for some frontier thinkers to take new ground for us and bring this basic truth up to date. The line of the new advance may be indicated in such a book as Dr. E. Stanley Jones' *Christ of Every Road*. I would particularly emphasize the splendid lectures on the subject by Dr. Paul S. Rees which were delivered here last year. I am sorry I have not had time to examine our own Dr. Turner's monograph on the subject. It does seem clear, however, that more light must be shed on the psychological factors of the sanctified life, and certainly more attention should be given to its ethical and social aspects.

The standard must be clearly and unequivocally set. There is nothing to be gained, however, by putting the standard too high and preaching something that we cannot experience. On the other hand, we must not lower the standard so that we condone wrong-doing of any kind, or tolerate an unchristian attitude or spirit. Both are enemies of the truth: they who make the way of salvation harder and straiter and narrower than the Bible does, and they who make the way too broad and easy.

CONCLUSION

We face a world that is in confusion. That goes for the religious situation quite as much as for the political, philosophical and scientific. Asbury Theological Seminary seems to have her work pretty well cut out for her. She has no denominational axe to grind, so she may serve the Church universal. Her aid is not needed in disseminating German rationalism and destructive criticism. The possibilities of that have been explored by others, and they have shown quite convincingly that vital godliness withers

in that climate. She need not major on the social implications of the Gospel. Too many seminaries have become lop-sided and have lost their vital, saving message to the world.

Dean Sperry gives us this illuminating analysis of the situation:

The idea of religion presupposes the paradox of God and man met in one experience. When either seems to monopolize that for which religion is supposed to stand, the dual quality which we associate with the experience is impaired. Neither the absolute sovereignty of God nor the final self-sufficiency of man preserves that which the idea of religion requires.⁵

I believe we may boast that this locates us. We have always maintained a position which may be called a synergistic essentialism. This is a median position between the theological left, humanistic liberalism, and the theological right which is crypto-Calvinistic neo-orthodoxy. Let us develop this field.

A critic says of theological seminar-

ies that they are the most artificial institutions in society. Their students are the most thwarted and repressed to be found anywhere. As for their faculties, personal religion with them is only a memory.

If that be true, so much the worse for seminaries. It must not be true for us. We cannot justify our existence except as we become specialists in the Spirit-filled life, the "life hid with Christ in God." That is *Agape*, perfect love, entire sanctification. We may boast that we are pioneers in that field now; it even appears that we have the field pretty much to ourselves—more is the pity. Let us develop it; let us expand it.

Lead on, O King eternal,
The day of march has come;
Henceforth in fields of conquest
Thy tents shall be our home.
Through days of preparation
Thy grace has made us strong,
And now, O King eternal,
We lift our battle song.

⁵ Sperry, p. 157.

Alumni Letter

DEAR FELLOW-ALUMNI:

I am greatly indebted to the Editor of this fine periodical for this privilege of addressing myself to you. You have doubtless heard of the organizing of our new Asbury Theological Seminary Alumni Association at the last commencement season. Space forbids my going into detail. Suffice it to say, all who were present for the occasion agree that we got off to an auspicious start. We regret it if you were not able to be there.

You are all aware that our Seminary is now fully accredited by the American Association of Theological Schools. This is, of course, the greatest thing ever to happen to the Seminary. But we must realize that this important step places upon every one of us tremendous responsibility as well as providing us with a glorious opportunity. I know you feel as I do, that Asbury Theological Seminary is "come to the Kingdom for such a time as this." God is making the way for us. Shall we walk therein?

As alumni of the Seminary we can do one or more of several things just now. First, we can become members in good standing in our new Alumni Association by sending in two dollars for our annual dues to Professor J. Harold Greenlee, Wilmore, Kentucky, our Secretary-Treasurer. Second, we can publicize the Seminary in our particular section and locality. Everywhere there are fine Christian young men and women anxiously looking for an institution like ours in which to secure the necessary training for their all-important calling. Experts tell us that the best publicity is by word of mouth. Then let us tell others about our Seminary, secure its literature for them, point out Asbury's advantages, and do all in our power to convince prospective students that Asbury is the place for which they are really looking. Third, let us be on the alert for any prospective friends for Asbury. There are many good Christian folk in the world to whom God has entrusted means who would gladly give of their monies to assist such an institution as ours. Do not hesitate to contact them. They will appreciate your doing so.

Finally, let us keep Asbury Theological Seminary in our prayers and on our hearts. This is highly important. We want to keep Asbury Theological Seminary clean. We want to maintain with increasing vigor a rugged emphasis upon the message for the proclamation of which Asbury Theological has been providentially raised up. God help us, Alumni, to give her our loyal support always to this end! Let us get busy and keep busy in the best interests of Asbury Theological Seminary.

Sincerely yours, In His Service

DON A. MORRIS, *President*

Asbury Theological Seminary Alumni Association
Saginaw, Michigan

The Date of the Exodus

RALPH M. EARLE, JR.

According to Ussher's chronology, which has been used widely in editions of the King James Version of the Bible, the exodus of the Israelites from Egypt under Moses took place in 1491 B. C. Ussher's work, of course, was based wholly upon Biblical data. Modern archaeological excavation has provided a new set of controls for Old Testament chronology. However, it is interesting to note that archaeology has confirmed the approximate correctness of many of Ussher's dates. This is especially true of his dating the life of Abraham, the destruction of Sodom and Gomorrah, and the entrance of Joseph into Egypt.¹

I. THE PROBLEM

Archaeological discoveries have seemingly served only to complicate the problem of the date of the exodus and of the conquest of Canaan. Equally eminent authorities have reached distressingly different conclusions from the available archaeological data. Burrows calls it "one of the most debated questions in all biblical history."²

The excavations of Naville in 1883, which he felt had uncovered the ancient store city of Pithom, seemed to identify Rameses II as the Pharaoh of the oppression, and his successor, Merneptah, as the Pharaoh of the Exodus. Since the latter began his reign in 1225 B. C. it was concluded that the exodus from Egypt took place at about that date.

Then came Garstang's excavations at Jericho which convinced him that the destruction of that city by Joshua and the Israelites took place at about 1407. That would date the exodus at 1447 B. C.

However, Garstang's conclusions have not been universally accepted. Albright has carefully reworked the data from Jericho and reached different conclusions from those of Garstang. At the same time such scholars as Theophile Meek have gone over the whole problem and arrived at still other results.

We shall want to notice five theories with regard to the date of the exodus. The first holds to a date around 1580 B. C. The second is that of Garstang, who places the event at about 1440. The third, defended by H. H. Rowley, goes to the opposite extreme by dating the exodus after the middle of the thirteenth century, at around 1240 B. C. The fourth is that held by Theophile Meek, of the University of Toronto. He proposes two invasions of Canaan: first by Joseph tribes, which had never been in Egypt, under the leadership of Joshua crossing the Jordan sometime around 1400, and a second one into Judah from the southern desert in the second half of the thirteenth century. This second invasion would agree with Rowley's date. The fifth theory is that advocated by Albright. He, too, suggests two phases or stages of the conquest. But he differs from Meek in holding that both conquering groups came out of Egypt. There was an exodus of the Joseph tribes between 1550 and 1400. This second group conquered Jericho between 1375 and 1300. The second

¹ Burrows, Millar: *What Mean These Stones?* pp. 71f. This volume hereafter referred to as WMTS.

² *Ibid.*, p. 72.

group left Egypt at about 1290 and conquered Lachish and Debir about 1230 B. C.

II. PROPOSED SOLUTIONS

1. The Earliest Date.

Some scholars have held that the exodus of the Israelites from Egypt took place at the time of the expulsion of the foreign Hyksos rulers. This took place between 1580 and 1550. The Hyksos domination of Egypt lasted about one hundred and fifty years, and Burrows argues that this is the most reasonable length of time for the sojourn of the Israelites in Egypt.³

But it appears evident that a date around 1580 is impossible. That would imply a date for the conquest of Canaan before 1500 and thus require a period of some five centuries for the times of the judges. That seems unreasonably long. So we shall have to reject the date of 1580 as being much too early.

2. Garstang's Theory.

As has already been noted, Garstang dates the exodus at about 1440 or 1447 B. C. He bases this partly upon the pottery found at Jericho. Speaking of the level at Jericho which gives every evidence of having been the city destroyed by the Israelites, he says:

Among the thousands of potsherds characteristic of the period, found among and below the ruins, not one piece of Mycenaean ware has been observed. This fact suggests that the fourteenth century had not begun at the time the walls fell.⁴

He confesses to finding one piece of Mycenaean art, a vase, but holds that it does not properly belong to the ruins of Jericho destroyed by Joshua. He writes concerning this vase:

It pertains, as the evidence shows, to a partial reoccupation of the northern extremity of the site, outside the former limits of the upper city and above the debris that marks its fall.⁵

Garstang dates this vase at about

1300, but thinks some houses were built on the edge of the ruins of Jericho some time after Joshua's day. He concludes his study of the destruction of the city by saying: "The evidence all points, then, towards the year 1400 B. C. for the fall of Jericho."⁶

In his preliminary discussion of "Chronology and Dates" he places the date of the exodus a little more definitely at 1447 B. C., basing this upon the passage found in I Kings 6:1.⁷ The significance of this passage will be noted a little later.

In *Bible and Spade* Caiger supports the date of Garstang, which makes Amenhotep II, rather than Merneptah, the Pharaoh of the Exodus. Caiger presents an array of English scholars in support of this early date.⁸ One gets the impression that recent English scholars tend to favor the early date. This is not true of American archaeologists today.

Professor G. Ernest Wright in his excellent article, "Epic of Conquest," in the *Biblical Archaeologist*, gives a good summary of Garstang's view. In the city cemetery at Jericho Garstang found many Egyptian scarabs in the tombs. The latest Pharaoh named on these scarabs is Amenophis III, who reigned about 1413 to 1377 B. C. (1415-1380, Burrows). Professor Wright discounts this evidence. He says: "Every Palestinian and Egyptian archaeologist knows that scarabs are not good evidence, since they were handed down as keepsakes and charms, and were widely imitated even centuries later."⁹

The other main argument used by Garstang was that of the pottery, as we have noted. Practically no Mycenaean ware was found in the ruins of

³ *Ibid*, p. 147.

⁴ *Ibid*, p. 55.

⁵ Caiger, Stephen L., *Bible and Spade*, p. 192.

⁶ *Biblical Archaeologist*, III, 3 (Sept., 1940), p. 34.

³ WMTS, p. 72.

⁴ Garstang, John: *Joshua-Judges*, p. 146.

⁵ *Joshua-Judges*, p. 147.

Jericho. Since this form of pottery did not appear much in Egypt and Palestine until after 1375 B. C., Garstang argues that the destruction of Jericho took place before that date.

But three pieces of this pottery were actually found on this site. As we have noted, Garstang believes that a later settlement was made on the edge of the ruins of the city. This idea Professor Wright rejects. He says: "There is little evidence, however, for such a reoccupation, and, as far as the writer is aware, no other leading archaeologist who is a pottery specialist accepts this view."¹⁰

The pottery unearthed at Jericho has been examined carefully by Professor W. F. Albright and Father H. Vincent, whom Wright labels "the two greatest authorities on Palestinian pottery."¹¹ Neither of these two scholars accepts Garstang's conclusions. Professor Albright thinks that the city was destroyed between 1375 and 1300 B. C. Father Vincent argues for a date around 1250. Professor Wright openly rejects Father Vincent's arguments, but finds himself in accord with Albright. He concludes: "One thing seems certain; the city fell after 1400 B. C., but how long after must remain an open question."¹²

One very important advantage of Garstang's date is that it fits the biblical data in Judges 11:26 and I Kings 6:1. In the latter passage we are told that Solomon began to build the temple "in the four hundred and eightieth year after the children of Israel came out of the land of Egypt." It is also indicated that this was in the fourth year of Solomon's reign. Assuming that this was 962 B. C., it would give a date of about 1442 B. C. for the exodus.

In Judges 11:26 Jephthah is quoted

¹⁰ *Op. cit.*, p. 35. See also his discussion in the *Westminster Historical Atlas*, pp. 37-40.

¹¹ *Ibid.*, p. 35.

¹² *Ibid.*, p. 36.

as saying that the Israelites had occupied the territory of Moab for three hundred years. If Jephthah lived at about 1100 B. C., which appears most reasonable, that would give us a date around 1400 for the conquest of Moab by Moses, shortly before the entrance into Canaan. However, this date for the occupation of Moab is questioned seriously by scholars today, on the basis of recent archaeological discovery.

The Amarna letters have been taken by some as evidence in favor of Garstang's date. These letters were written by Canaanite kings in Palestine and Syria to Amenophis IV, who reigned about 1377-1359. Abdi-Hepa, King of Jerusalem, complains that certain people called the Habiru (or Khabiru) are invading his territories. The name occurs over and over again on these tablets, while on those of other Kings the invaders are called SA-GAZ (cutthroats). These Habiru are pretty generally identified with the Hebrews. But the evidence here is somewhat confused, especially since the names of the kings of Canaan on the Amarna tablets do not agree with those listed in Joshua.

George L. Robinson holds to this early date for the Exodus. He places the fourth year of Solomon's reign at 965 B. C., which would give a date of 1445 B. C. for the Exodus. He seeks to show that that harmonizes with the statement in Exodus 12:40 that the Israelites were in Egypt for 430 years (1875-1445).¹³

3. The Latest Date.

Back in 1883 Naville excavated what he took to be the site of Pithom, one of the treasure cities of Rameses II. The identification is disputed, but many scholars have concluded from the Egyptian excavations that Rameses II was the Pharaoh of the oppres-

¹³ Robinson, Geo. L., *Bearing of Archaeology on the O. T.*, pp. 55f.

sion. This view is well expressed in the article "Chronology of the Old Testament," by E. L. Curtis, in *Hastings Dictionary of the Bible*. There we read:

The Pharaoh of the oppression, under whom the children of Israel built the treasure cities Pithom and Raamses (Ex. 1:11) was Ramses II. This fact, long conjectured, has been definitely settled by Naville's identification of Pithom, and discovery that it was built by Ramses II.¹⁴

This quotation will serve to show the attitude of finality taken toward this question by reputable scholars of a generation or so ago. For some of them it was "definitely settled" by the archaeological discoveries in Egypt. This view is presented by the late George A. Barton in his monumental work, *Archaeology and the Bible* (Seventh Edition Revised, 1937). He declares that Rameses II was the Pharaoh of the oppression.¹⁵ That would, as commonly inferred, make Merneptah the Pharaoh of the Exodus. One piece of evidence that is pertinent to the point is that the mummy of Merneptah has been found, buried like those of his predecessors. It could be seen in the Gizeh Museum at Cairo before the discovery of Tutankhamen's tomb. At least he was not drowned in the Red Sea, although some effort has been made to show that he was.

In connection with Merneptah it would be well to notice his pillar or stele, which was discovered by Petrie in 1896. It is of special interest as being the earliest inscription that mentions Israel outside the Bible. We quote part of the text as given by Barton:

Plundered is Canaan with every evil
Carried off is Askelon,
Seized upon is Gezer,
Yenoan is made as a thing not existing.
Israel is desolated, his seed is not;
Palestine has become a widow for Egypt.¹⁶

Holding as he does that the Israelites left Egypt in the reign of Merneptah, Barton is perplexed by their presence in Palestine at that time. It appears impossible to hold that all of Israel left under Moses during the reign of Merneptah. Either the Exodus occurred at an earlier date or in more than one section. The only other possible alternative would be that some Israelites did not go down into Egypt at all but stayed in or near Palestine. These last two possibilities have been suggested by recent scholars. The evidence of the Stele of Merneptah is thus definitely in favor of the earlier date for the Exodus and opposed to the late date theory.

While the Stele of Merneptah argues against the late date, there is another piece of evidence that seems to favor it very definitely. That is the mention of a people called "Apiru" on the Egyptian inscriptions. The name is identified by Burrows as "doubtless the Hebrews."¹⁷ Since Rameses II mentions these people as being employed by him in heavy labor it would argue that the Hebrews did not leave Egypt until probably the time of his successor, Merneptah. But this view is complicated by an inscription of Rameses IV which indicates that there were *Habiru* in Egypt at about 1160 B. C.¹⁸

The identification of the *Habiru* with the Hebrews is still a debatable point. Barton gives the form *prw* as equal to *Aperu* or *Apuri*. Burrows adopts the form 'Apiru. Wright prefers the form *Khabiru*. Cyrus Gordon cites the occurrence of the term on the Nuzu tablets and says: "Most scholars accept the identification of a people called *Habiru* in the cuneiform in-

¹⁴ *Hastings Dictionary of the Bible*, vol. I, p. 26.

¹⁵ p. 398.

¹⁶ Barton, Geo. A., *Archaeology and the Bible*,

p. 376. See also H. H. Rowley, "Early Levite History and the Question of the Exodus" in *Journal of Near Eastern Studies*, III, No. 2 (April, 1944), pp. 73-78.

¹⁷ WMTS, pp. 74f.

¹⁸ *Ibid*, p. 75.

scriptions with the Hebrews."¹⁹

The main contribution of the references in the Nuzu tablets is to the effect that the Habiru were normally slaves. Dr. Gordon, in fact, contends that originally the term "Hebrew" referred not to a nation, a religion, or a language, but to a social status. He concludes by saying: "It is too soon to say what bearing the Habiru data may have on the study of the enslavement of the Hebrews in Egypt."²⁰

The Habiru appear prominently on tablets of about 1800 B. C. from the reign of Haran, in northern Mesopotamia, where Abraham lived for a time. We read of them as employed by the Pharaohs of Egypt at around 1300 B. C. Wright agrees with Gordon that the term refers primarily to social status.²¹

There is one other important result of recent archaeological exploration which definitely favors the later date for the Exodus rather than the earlier one. We refer to the work of Dr. Nelson Glueck in Transjordan. Dr. Glueck has described his discoveries in Transjordan with admirable clearness in his recent book, *The Other Side of the Jordan* (1940). The main point which is pertinent to our discussion is that while he found abundant evidence of the existence of a settled population in this region before the time of Abraham, yet from about 2000 to 1300 B. C. there were no large towns or cities in the territories of Ammon, Moab, or Edom. The Biblical account seems clearly to indicate that there were well-established kingdoms there when the Israelites approached Palestine on the east.

As a result of his explorations in this region Dr. Glueck has come to the conclusion that the earlier date for

the exodus is untenable. He writes:

It becomes impossible, therefore, in the light of all this new archaeological evidence, particularly when studied in connection with the deposits of historical memory contained in the Bible, to escape the conclusion that the particular Exodus of the Israelites through southern Transjordan could not have taken place before the 13th century B. C. . . . Had the Exodus through southern Transjordan taken place before the 13th century B. C., the Israelites would have found neither Edomite nor Moabite kingdoms, well organized and well fortified, whose rulers could have given or withheld permission to go through their territories.²²

Glueck's findings are corroborated by Gordon. In a very interesting chapter on "Exploring Edom and Moab" he says:

An examination of hundreds of sites showed that the countries were heavily occupied from the twenty-third to the nineteenth century B. C. Then there was a virtual blank with no occupied cities until the thirteenth century B. C. Now the historic importance of that is obvious to any Bible student because it is stated that the children of Israel wandered through that territory only to meet with opposition on the way to the Promised Land. Until the thirteenth century there could have been no such opposition because the land was devoid of a settled population. Therefore, the fifteenth century date of the Exodus that most scholars had been adhering to is quite out of the question, and we are obliged to return to the traditional date of the Exodus and Conquest in the thirteenth century.²³

In his *New Light on Hebrew Origins*, J. Garrow Duncan gives no less than nine arguments in favor of dating the exodus at around 1226 B. C. Several of these do not seem to us to be very convincing. But we mention two. The first is that chariots of iron are mentioned in Joshua 17:16, whereas iron was not commonly used in Palestine until the twelfth century. The other has to do with the reference to Philistines in Joshua 13:2. Duncan maintains with most scholars that "according to present results of archaeology the Philistines were not present in force till the twelfth century."²⁴

¹⁹ *Biblical Archaeologist*, III, 1 (Feb., 1940), p. 12.

²⁰ *Loc. cit.*

²¹ *Biblical Archaeologist*, III, 3 (Sept., 1940), p. 31. See also R. H. Pfeiffer, *Introduction to the Old Testament*, p. 215.

²² Glueck, Nelson, *The Other Side of the Jordan*, pp. 146f.

²³ Gordon, Cyrus H., *The Living Past*, pp. 36f.

²⁴ Duncan, J. G., *New Light on Hebrew Origins*, pp. 188f.

J. N. Schofield in his book, *The Historical Background of the Bible* (1938), emphasizes these two arguments. With regard to the appearance of iron in Palestine he writes:

A fairly accurate date for the introduction of iron through Asia Minor into Egypt is given by the discovery at Boghaz Keui of the cuneiform copy of a letter from Ramses II to Hattushil, the Hittite king in the first half of the thirteenth century, asking him to supply him with smelted iron.²⁵

There is another argument used by Duncan which is set forth more clearly and fully by Schofield. That is, that the Egyptians were in control of Palestine until the time of Rameses III or from about 1600 to 1200 B. C. Why is it that their presence and domination is never mentioned in the Biblical record? But Schofield admits that the actual Egyptian rule of Palestine may have been slight, so that it could have been passed over in silence by the Hebrew chronicler.

The thirteenth century date for the exodus is further supported by the excavations at Bethel, Lachish, and Debir. The excavation of Bethel by Albright in 1934 indicated that there was a prosperous city there which was destroyed by fire, probably in the first half of the thirteenth century. Of course this date, offered by Albright, would place the Exodus considerably earlier than 1226 or 1240, but would still permit it to be left in the thirteenth century.

Apparently Lachish (now identified with Tell Duweir) was destroyed in the latter part of the thirteenth century. Among the ruins of this city was found a bowl bearing a date in the fourth year of some Pharaoh. Egyptologists are agreed that the writing comes from about the time of Merneptah and Albright dates it definitely thus at 1231 B. C. Hauptert holds that his argument on this point

is "almost irrefutable."²⁶

The third city, Debir, or Kiriath-sepher, has been identified with Tell Beit Mirsim, where excavations have been carried on for several seasons by Professor Albright. Here again it has been discovered that the city was destroyed at about the time of Lachish.

The evidence found at the ruins of Ai is much more difficult to handle. It does not harmonize with any date for the exodus and conquest. For excavations at the probable site of Ai indicate that it was a flourishing city between 3000 and 2200 B. C., but that at the latter date it was destroyed and abandoned. The evidence seems clear that, regardless of where we put the date of the exodus, the place was in ruins when Joshua and the Israelites entered Canaan.

Several theories have been offered to account for this disconcerting discovery. The name Ai in Hebrew means "the Ruin." So some have suggested that the story in Joshua is a later invention to account for the presence of this ruin. Father Vincent has advanced the theory that the people of Bethel—which was a mile and a half away—occupied Ai temporarily to form an advance guard against the Israelites. A third suggestion combines the other two by saying that the story of the conquest of Bethel (which is omitted, strangely, in Joshua) was transferred to Ai to account for the ruins there. This last theory has been set forth by Albright. It has also been suggested that there actually was a city there, which was not discovered by the excavators. Burrows favors Albright's view, though allowing the bare possibility that another city may yet be discovered at the site.²⁷ He makes the sanguine remark that "the peculiar problem of the conquest of Ai is more difficult for the modern exe-

²⁵ Schofield, J. N., *The Historical Background of the Bible*, p. 79.

²⁶ *Biblical Archaeologist*, I, 4 (Dec., 1938), p. 26.

²⁷ WMTS, p. 273.

gete than it was for the children of Israel."²⁸

Kenyon offers another escape from the difficulty. He says:

It is, however, not certain that the identification of Et Tell with Ai is correct, and archaeologists are by no means unanimous in their interpretation of the evidence. It is to be remembered also that the transference of a name from a ruined or abandoned site to another near by is a common phenomenon in Palestine.²⁹

Frankly, the suggestion of Kenyon appeals most to us, as doing least violence to the historicity of the Biblical account. The matter is not closed, and further light on the problem may yet appear. In the meantime, we make no apology for accepting the record given in Joshua.

Burrows feels that the bulk of the archaeological evidence from Palestine favors a late date. He says:

With the exception of Jericho, therefore, and perhaps of Bethel, the cities which have been excavated testify to a date for the conquest which agrees with the evidence that the exodus took place about 1300 B. C. or a little later.³⁰

It is readily apparent that each of the three dates discussed thus far is beset with almost insuperable difficulties. It is for this reason that Meek and Albright, seeking to take into consideration all the available archaeological data, have adopted more complicated theories in place of the simpler datings. We shall note briefly their suggestions.

4. Meek's Hypothesis

Theophile Meek has won a wide hearing for his theory in recent years. He holds that the coming of the Habiru into Palestine, mentioned in the Amarna letters, was just one of the invasions of the Bedouin from the desert into the Fertile Crescent. One

group, under Joshua, conquered Jericho in the fourteenth century. Other groups formed the kingdoms of Ammon, Moab, and Edom. Some of the Bedouin went down into Egypt and were led out of that country by Moses at about 1200 B. C. This latter group invaded Palestine directly from the south, instead of going east of the Dead Sea.

Meek's theory thus calls for two invasions of Palestine: one by the Joseph tribes under Joshua at around 1400 B. C.; the other by Moses in the latter part of the thirteenth century.

The most obvious objection to this reconstruction is that it clearly cannot be harmonized with the Biblical account. The most glaring divergence is that it places Joshua about one hundred and fifty years before Moses. It also denies that the Joseph tribes were in Egypt, which is contrary to the Biblical record.

While a considerable number of scholars have accepted Meek's view, it is doubtful if it will gain universal approval. Some of its foundations are very flimsy. Like most such reconstructions it is built with the rather copious use of speculative material.

Graham and May, in *Culture and Conscience*, came to this conclusion in the matter:

The status of this problem does not permit one at present to commit one's self absolutely to any of these views. Yet the consensus of judgment seems to be moving toward the later date for the exodus; and it seems increasingly probable that the final reconstruction of the political and cultural history will be distinctly indebted to the ideas of Professor Meek and of those who stimulated him.³¹

In favor of Meek's basic contention we could perhaps say that the traditional treatment of the conquest of Palestine has sometimes failed to take into account all the varied data of Joshua and Judges. Certainly the pic-

²⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 272.

²⁹ Kenyon, Frederick, *Bible and Archaeology*, p. 190.

³⁰ WMTS, pp. 77f.

³¹ Graham, W. C. and Herbert G. May, *Culture and Conscience*, p. 74.

ture there is not as simple as it has often been assumed.

5. Albright's Theory

While granting the force of some of Meek's arguments, Professor Albright is the exponent of a view which accords rather better with the Biblical account.

Albright maintains that the exodus from Egypt took place in two sections. The first consisted of the Joseph tribe or tribes, which left Egypt soon after the expulsion of the Hyksos, i.e. after 1550. This group conquered Jericho between 1375 and 1300, the time of the destruction of that city according to Albright. The second group, led by Moses and Joshua, left Egypt about 1290 and conquered Lachish and Debir at about 1230 B. C. It will thus be seen that Albright puts the main exodus from Egypt at about 1290 B. C.

A quotation from his book, *Archaeology of Palestine and the Bible*, will put the matter clearly before us. He says:

There is now a strong tendency to date the Conquest about 1400 B. C. The writer's view is that the Conquest began in the time of the Patriarchs, as described in Genesis 34, 48:22, etc., and continued intermittently during the subsequent period, with one phase in the late sixteenth or early fifteenth century (Jericho and Ai), and a culminating triumph after the establishment of the Israelite confederation by Moses, in the second half of the thirteenth century.³²

In his chapter on "The Present State of Syro-Palestinian Archaeology" in *The Haverford Symposium on Archaeology and the Bible* Professor Albright writes:

The date of the Israelite conquest of Palestine still remains obscure, though the available evidence proves that the main wave of destruction fell in the thirteenth century and that the re-occupation of the more important towns must be dated between 1250 and 1150 B. C. Jericho clearly fell before the principal phase of the conquest, but it is by no means certain just what this fact indicates when applied to Hebrew tradition.³³

It is evident that Albright's view

seeks to face all the relevant facts and find a place for them. By postulating a lesser exodus previous to the main one this view accords with the evidence at Jericho and the testimony of Merneptah's Stele to the effect that Israelites were in Palestine during the reign of that Pharaoh. Also, by placing the main exodus in the thirteenth century, it finds itself in accord with the Egyptian evidence at Pithom and Raamses and the Palestinian evidence at Lachish and Debir.

III. CONCLUSION

Apparently we shall have to accept the dictum of the doctors and confess our inability to solve the problems created by the various data for the exodus from Egypt and the conquest of Canaan. One hardly dares to subscribe fully to either the fifteenth or thirteenth century date for the exodus. To do so one has to give the impression of ignoring certain relevant facts.

Of course the early sixteenth century date can be dismissed with little comment. It is not so easy to eliminate the theories of Meek and Albright. They at least have the virtue of facing the facts and seeking to account for them, though they tend seriously to discount the historicity of the Biblical data.

Perhaps I should record my own reactions on the subject. I began this present study with a strong bias in favor of Garstang's date, having been pretty well convinced by his arguments concerning Jericho. But I do not now feel entirely convinced either way. While the fifteenth century date has been held by the bulk of scholars in England in recent years, the trend now appears to be definitely away from that view in this country. Some have swung back to the traditional thirteenth century date, as expressed by Cyrus Gordon in the quotation given above. Others are finding a resting place for the time being in the theories of Meek or Albright.

³² Albright, Wm. E., *Archaeology of Palestine and the Bible*, pp. 197f.

³³ p. 23.

Inasmuch as we are dealing with an event which antedates the period in which an exact chronology can be established, it seems the part of wisdom to avoid an undue dogmatism in holding to any of the above theories. I cannot close this article without calling attention to the fact that the fifteenth century date seems to accord best with the Biblical data. It must be remembered that difficulties are not the same as proved errors. Hence there is no valid reason for rejecting the Biblical

dating, which is reached by moving back from *established dates* (e.g. that of the establishment of the Monarchy) by the number of years indicated in the records as consumed by intervening events, in favor of dates which are themselves contradicted by other events in both Egypt and Canaan. It is possible that larger information may make a place in both the history of Egypt and that of Palestine and Trans-Jordania for an Exodus in the fifteenth century B. C.

THE PRESIDENT'S LETTER

(Concluded from page 81)

A new department has been established in the field of Christian Education, offering the M.R.E. degree. Two new members have been added to the faculty in this department to assist Dr. B. Joseph Martin who heads the department. The new staff members in this department are James D. Robertson, Ph.D., and C. Elvan Olmstead, Ph.D., This new department meets an increasing demand in the field of Christian Education.

The Ministers Conference for 1947 will be held February 25-27. The two principal lecturers at the conference will be Bishop Edwin Holt Hughes and Dr. R. P. Shuler. Other special lecturers for the year will be Russell R. Patton, A.B., Th.B., B.D., in the field of Practical Theology, Dr. G. W. Ridout in the field of Biographies of Holiness Leaders, and Dr. Richard E. Day in a series on Beacon Lights of Faith. Holiness Emphasis Week, sponsored by the student body will be observed April 7-11, 1947, with Dr. Harry E. Jessop as speaker.

The year is full of promise at Asbury Theological Seminary and we earnestly request that our friends continue to undergird the institution with their prayers.

Unity and Diversity in New Testament Theology

HAROLD B. KUHN

It has been questioned, whether it is proper to speak of a New Testament *theology* at all: whether, that is, there be any theology characteristic of the New Testament as a whole; and whether it might not be more true to the facts to attempt to reconstruct *theologies* represented by the several writers of the documents. Such a view springs from what is considered by many to be an exaggeration of the element of variety, at the expense of the element of unity which the New Testament as a whole presents.

In general, conservative and traditional theology has inclined to overwork the idea of unity; while liberal theology has tended to make rather more of the diversity existing within the thought of the writers of the respective books. Orthodox thought was willing to recognize stylistic and linguistic differences; but it assumed, frequently with naïvete, that each writer was exercising his genius, under inspiration, to say the same thing, but in a somewhat different manner. On the other hand, liberal criticism has sought to magnify the points of difference; and in the process of analysis, the fact that there is a basic homogeneity in the New Testament has frequently been forgotten. The tendency, marked especially among German scholars, to found a new "school" of criticism has issued in an atomization of the New Testament, the results of which would lead the indiscriminating reader to conclude that the Christian Scriptures are but an accidental agglomeration of writings collected upon

the basis of some kind of sacrosanctity. It is unnecessary to evaluate the motives by which such scholarship is impelled. But certain criticisms may be allowed at this point.

It has frequently been assumed that the writers of the documents of the New Testament uniformly wrote with a tendency to produce tracts for the purpose of Christian "propaganda"—this term is used without intent of implying a value judgment upon the motive. Nevertheless, it is characteristic of much of liberal criticism, that the writers are assumed to have subordinated all other considerations to the matter of producing a convincing tract, and that they wrote with an "explicit aim at propaganda."¹ Presumably matters of historical accuracy were compelled to yield before the *tendenz*.

Again, it may be thought by some to be more than coincidence, that the results of much of criticism have proved negative (from the point of view of traditional orthodoxy), and that scholars of the more negative type have but grudgingly acknowledged the work of contemporaries, who seemed to "give back" to a given author the authorship of works traditionally ascribed to him, but by the "new school" denied him. This procedure is not such as to elicit unanimous and unbounded confidence in the objectivity of the critics. When it is necessary to rely upon inference, why not occasionally draw *positive* inference, in-

¹ Dibelius, Martin: *From Tradition to Gospel* (New York, Scribner's, 1935), p. 288.

stead of negative?

Furthermore, the tendency to place as large a space of time between the events recorded and the time of recording as is possible, is one capable of more than one interpretation. For instance, if a scholar decide that the *Gospel of Mark* was written prior to the fall of Jerusalem; and then if he place his hypothetical date of writing as near to the year 70 as is decently possible, it may legitimately be questioned whether the dating itself may not express an *a priori* judgment concerning the placing of the date, which is in itself a "tendency."

In line with the same possible danger of deciding what in the nature of things *must* have been the case may be mentioned the apparent treatment by liberal criticism of the element of the supernatural in the New Testament. Whereas traditional theology has doubtless yielded to the (understandable) temptation to lift into prominence those features which support the supernaturalism which is one of the assumptions of orthodoxy, and to minimize or suppress those features of variety which would imperil that supernaturalism;—so also liberalism has by its dissection of the New Testament removed those traces of proper supernaturalism from the records (which is likewise a contribution to its assumptions), by giving undue prominence to the element of diversity, so that the unity of the message of the New Testament is lost; the result of this being that the Christian Scriptures appear but an aggregation, like a heap of unassorted stones thrown together.

It is not easy to compare these two tendencies; but it may be said at least, that the traditionalists have somewhat the "edge" of the matter, in that they have the substantial support of the documents *as they stand*, and as they have been received for centuries. It is worthy of notice also that these Scrip-

tures were received by the Church in a period much nearer to the events described than the nineteenth and twentieth centuries—a Church which may prove after all not to have been so uncritical as has been supposed. It is probable that the truth lies between the two poles of interpretation: that within the basic unity of the New Testament there is a large play of diversity, not only of style, but of point of view, among the writers; that these writers were grappling with vast spiritual questions—some will contend that they did so under a guidance of the Holy Spirit unlike that by which he guided men at other times—and that out of this diversity came the true interpretation of the Good News.

I. EARLY THEOLOGY AS EMBEDDED IN NEW TESTAMENT NARRATIVE.

It would not be suitable to here deal with the problem of the variety of literary style which appears in the New Testament. It goes without saying, that the writers used the Greek of their time; and that some employed a style recognized as lacking in polish, while others wrote in a manner more acceptable to the educated of the day. Again, there is a great variety in form: some portions purport to be direct history; some are didactic, some are hortatory, while some approach lyric style.

Concerning the theology of the New Testament, it may be noted first that a difficult transition was made, namely from Judaism to Jewish Christianity; and from the primitive Jewish Church to the Gentile Church. It is not easy to trace the steps from the earliest proclamation of the Gospel to the establishment of Gentile Christianity. In the first place, the early Christian community in Jerusalem was not homogeneous; while also the Gentile Church was diverse and early beset by internal differences in its local units. Nor do we possess any complete

record of the development of early Christianity. The *Book of Acts* has been, on the one hand, accepted uncritically as a compendium of early church history; and on the other hand, treated as a mere *tendenz Schrift*, written to establish certain motives, and suppressing traditions incompatible with them.²

Ernest W. Parsons, in his volume, *The Religion of the New Testament*,³ has carried the analysis of the religious beliefs of the New Testament writers to a fine point; it is not necessary here to evaluate his book, further than to note that not all readers would be disposed to find so little in common among (for example) the authors of the Synoptics. But it is necessary first to answer another question: were the Evangelists interested in portraying with fidelity the life of Jesus, or were they merely constructing tracts, with a quasi-historical basis, shaped toward the end of expressing a theological motif? Perhaps this would in turn require the answer to a prior question: were they in possession of any reliable information at all concerning the life of Jesus?

Against the view that they were seeking to act as conventional biographers stands the fact that they produced "biographies" of the most selective sort, the selected materials being such as to create a total impression of Jesus as a person of supernatural powers, standing at the center of significant incidents, and frequently uttering statements of high ethical and religious value. But the fact that they wrote in such a manner as to convey such an impression does not necessarily indicate that the historical matrix in which their religious and ethical message was set was unreliable.

In other words, the writers of the

Synoptics may have been more interested in presenting a brief picture of a Person, than in setting forth their own private theologies. With the author of the Fourth Gospel it is somewhat otherwise. He has evidently made the biographical element secondary, and has sought to record the longer discourses of our Lord, with a view to setting forth a sector of His teachings which were not otherwise current in written form. Hoskyns and Davey are not too convincing⁴ in stating that the Synoptics testify against the probability that Jesus uttered long discourses. For it may be that the Sermon on the Mount of *Matthew* may have been uttered on a specific occasion, and that likewise portions of it may have been repeated upon many occasions, so that *Luke* is not far wrong in quoting portions as spoken piecemeal. If this view be considered but a repetition of the blunders of the Harmonists, let it be said that the same treatment might be made of any preacher-teacher in any age.

The question here is, it seems to the writer, whether in the Gospels the interest is primarily historical and only secondarily theological; or whether the reverse is the case. The writer is inclined to the former view, with all of the problems which it implies. It will be always necessary to fall back upon the possibility that the ministry of our Lord was of sufficient length, and above all, of sufficient depth and variety, to permit of both Synoptic and Johannine treatment. Thus, it may be questioned whether we in the twentieth century are in a position to deny categorically that the same Jesus portrayed in the Synoptics *could* have spoken as recorded by the author of the Fourth Gospel. In other words, may not both evangelistic traditions be the recording of actual sayings of our Lord, current in the tradition of

² Scott, Ernest F.: *The Varieties of New Testament Religion* (New York: Scribner's, 1944), pp. 42, 292.

³ New York: Harper & Bros., 1939.

⁴ Hoskyns & Davey, *Riddle of the New Testament* (London: Faber & Faber, 1936), p. 211f.

the early Church, and selected out of larger materials which were available? This is, of course, out of harmony with the view that the author of *Mark* wrote down all he knew,⁵ and that the other two Synopticians added what they knew; and that the author of *John* employed a favorite literary device, that of putting speeches into the mouth of the character, to convey his personal theology to the reader.⁶ But it is just possible that much more concerning the life of Jesus was held in solution in the tradition of the early Church, and that the authors of the four Gospels precipitated such elements as they saw fit; or to put it another way, that these authors were guided by the Divine Spirit to record selectively such portions of the current tradition as should be of convenient size for transmission as the inheritance of the Church Universal.

Probably this view raises more questions for some than the acceptance of the opposite view. It may be argued, however, that the Christology of the four Gospels may not prove to be as diverse as many critics have thought—that the Messianism of *Mark* 13 may not be so completely out of harmony with the supposed "Hellenism" of the Fourth Gospel, and that the Pauline view of Christ is less easily divorced from that of the Evangelists than some critics believe.⁷ It needs to be asked, whether the theology of *Mark*, and especially his Christology, was an innovation, something entirely foreign to the primitive tradition. This is not a closed question; for *Mark* may or may not be a reading-back of later thought into the life of Jesus. Could it not be possible that the life of Jesus itself produced the later Christology, rather than contrariwise?

All this represents a reopening of one basic question: was the life of Jesus marked by supernatural works, properly so-called, so that it inspired a tradition which was later recorded and which was true to the facts? Or was there an evolution of types of theology, varying with the community, which at a much later date sought to ground themselves in fabricated "lives of Jesus"—fabricated by the adaptation of legends concerning the life of some obscure Galilean peasant, who may, it is true, have possessed unique spiritual insights, but who was but a man nevertheless? Again, what did Jesus think of Himself, and say of Himself? Perhaps by judging that the words of Jesus were sufficiently varied and comprehensive to have made possible a selection by the Synopticians and by John, with perhaps some left over, we come nearer to the truth.

Thus far we have been concerned with the theology (or theologies) embedded in the narrative material of the New Testament. If the narratives represent the reading-back of several theologies into a nebulous tradition concerning the life of Jesus, then we are afforded a sidelight upon the theology of early Christianity—that it was seeking a form of expression which, in spite of its diversities, could be harmonized with what "people were saying" about Jesus, now long since dead. On the other hand, it may be that the writers wrote with a primary interest in biography and history; and that the life of Jesus was such that it afforded a background for a rich and varied biographical representation—as varied as that presented by the Synoptics and by the Fourth Gospel. It would follow then, that these writers would select their material, even depend upon one another, with a general aim in view, but without conscious motive to distort, suppress, or regiment facts. This would presuppose a degree of unanimity of theological

⁵ Grant, Frederick C.: *The Earliest Gospel* (New York and Nashville: Abingdon-Cokesbury, 1943), p. 72. Cf. p. 58.

⁶ Scott, *op. cit.*, pp. 253f.

⁷ Parsons, *op. cit.*, p. 83.

thought in the primitive Church which could result only upon the basis of the life of a Man who was unique among men, and whose life was both well known and accurately remembered by His followers.

It will be objected, that if such were the case, why did not some early Christian write a systematic theology? We can but conjecture why it was not so; perhaps the strength of the apocalyptic hope militated against it. Again, it may be argued that the real significance of the events of the life of Jesus, and of His words, was grasped but slowly by the primitive Christian church. This is not to be wondered at; we today are slow to comprehend, in spite of the aids at our disposal. And if the Evangelists were wrestling with some truths beyond their powers of comprehension, it would not be surprising if their selection of episodes from the life of our Lord should be influenced by that factor.

Much the same thought can be pursued in the case of the book of *Acts*. Some may feel that its author has distorted the total picture by his sketchiness, rather than by inaccuracies.⁸ But on the whole, its author appears to have familiarized himself rather fully with the geographical and historical details in which his record is set. The degree to which his document was conditioned by theological interest is open to question. It is true that *Acts* contains statements concerning Jesus which could be construed to be those of a pre-Synoptic Christology.⁹ But the presence of these may be explained in more than one way: it is possible that the author was imply inventing speeches for his characters, and drawing upon some primitive sources; on the other hand, something

might be said for the view that the author had access to individuals who heard the speeches, and that the speakers purposely made their messages simple, in view of the capacities of the group to which they were addressing themselves.

Much more might be said concerning the speeches attributed to Paul in *Acts* as compared with the Epistles of Paul. Probably the magnitude of the Pauline mind and style renders any conclusion at this point indecisive. But the author of *Acts* may fairly be said, in spite of an element of interpretation, to have attempted to give to his friend-correspondent a hasty sketch of the history of the early Church, selecting again material which he felt to be of interest to Theophilus, and majoring especially upon a few characters of whom he knew somewhat: Peter, John, Stephen, James, and Paul—all this without an attempt at being exhaustive — and yet not be wholly chargeable with writing from theological purpose.

The foregoing indicates no impossibility that there was growth in the theology of the primitive Church. Doubtless whatever early Christians knew of Jesus was cause for thought; and it is not to be wondered that they wrestled with these things and that their thought produced variety. But within that variety may be found, the writer thinks, a fundamental unity which renders it possible to speak of the theology of the Gospels and *Acts*. That unity finds its *locus* in the view that Jesus of Nazareth was recognized of God as a unique Person, and that He recognized Himself as being not merely one who sustained a peculiar relation to God, but as being in a class apart from all other men. This Jesus was related to the national hope of Israel; and also, His death stood in causal relation to God's redeeming purposes.

Diverse were the interpretations of

⁸ Foakes Jackson, *Beginnings of Christianity*, Vol I., (New York: Macmillan, 1920), p. 313.

⁹ Grant, F. C.: *The Significance of Divergence and Growth in the N. T.* (In *Christendom*, Vol. 4, p. 577f., 1939).

the mode of His relation to God, and of the relation of His *parousia* to the events of human history. Nor was there formulation of his metaphysical relation to God, or of His nature. Some attempts were made to express these, but the whole represents rather a picture like the following: the life (and death) of Jesus created an overpowering total impression upon the primitive Church; this total impression was greater than the sum of its details, which details were at first but dimly seen. Only gradually were they perceived, pondered, and systematized; and the records of the New Testament narratives preserve for us two related trends: the development of the theological thought of the authors themselves; and the growth of theology in the Church of the first century.

II. THE THEOLOGY OF THE CORRESPONDENCE OF THE NEW TESTAMENT

The term "correspondence" is employed here somewhat arbitrarily to indicate those portions of the New Testament which are ordinarily styled "epistles," although *I Peter* is more like a sermon, while *Hebrews* opens like an oration and closes like a letter. It is not the purpose of this section to discuss the authorship of the Epistles, nor to trace their theology, line by line. But there are evidences of both unity and diversity in the theological thought there set forth; and it may be profitable to consider these, to discover, if possible, whether there be any basic unity in them, and whether they be organically related upon a theological basis.

A consideration of the correspondence of the New Testament will concern itself most largely with the letters of Paul. To trace in any detail the Pauline treatment of the several doctrines which he develops would expand this article beyond tolerable limits. But to select one specifically

Pauline doctrine as an example for study, as for instance his view of the death of Jesus and its significance, will afford a basis for judging the nature of his thought as a whole—especially with respect to the element of unity and diversity, and its correlate, the element of growth.

In handling this subject, Paul frequently speaks in terms remarkably like those of the writers of the Synoptics.¹⁰ For example, the element of ransom, stated thus: "ye were bought with a price," is not foreign to the thought of *Mark* 10:45. In this and similar statements, he seeks to be conscious of the need for giving some explanation of that which he frequently takes for granted, namely, that the death of Jesus stood in causal relation to the salvation of men.

In setting this forth, he employs a number of figures: that of the ransom price, the propitiatory offering, the "becoming a curse for us," the being "made sin for use," etc. This indicates that the Apostle was wrestling with a matter which was too pregnant with meaning to be adequately stated in any single formula. Nor did he overlook the relation between the death of Jesus and the sacrificial institutions of Judaism.¹¹ His method is not that of the author of the First Gospel, who seeks specific references from the Old Testament to substantiate his statements. Before deciding just what use Paul made of the Old Testament in his interpretation of the death of Jesus, it would be necessary to decide his meaning in *I Cor.* 15:3—whether by "received" he is speaking of a direct and personal revelation, or whether he is indicating that he secured this information from a written revelation. This cannot be decided; but there is weight in favor of Scott's view, that his own personal experience of forgiveness through Christ may have shaped his

¹⁰ Parsons: *op. cit.*, p. 79ff.

¹¹ *Ibid.*, p. 81.

thought in this matter;¹² and, like George Fox, he may have turned to the Scriptures after his experience, and "found them agreeable thereto." Paul certainly had pondered the meaning of parts of the Old Testament during his training; and it is possible that his later interpretation of the death of Jesus as a sacrificial transaction may have been the result of several currents in his life and experience.

A consideration of Paul's Christology reveals likewise the same phenomenon: that he was wrestling with problems of great depth; while giving no indication that he considered either explanation to be exhaustive. But his experience on the Damascus Road brought him into contact with a somewhat "different Jesus" than the early apostles has known. Some have felt that Paul emphasized the fact that Jesus was declared the Son of God by the Resurrection, and that hence he tacitly acknowledged the inadequacy of a true view of the life of Jesus to afford any confirmation of the Messianic claim. Perhaps this also may be capable of another explanation: that his interest in the whole question was conditioned by the overpowering vision afforded him on the Damascus Road; and that he left the publication of the details of Jesus' life to experts who knew Him.

His concern with the pre-existence of Jesus parallels that of the Fourth Evangelist in that pre-existence is connected with creation. And this interest in pre-existence is essentially a metaphysical interest; and may fairly be said to challenge Parsons' statement, that Paul's monotheism was so rigid as to preclude any interest on his part in the metaphysical implications of the terms: "Son of God," "Lord," and the like.¹³

Thus all of Paul's thought manifests a development; and his statements are

frequently partial, given in didactic or hortatory settings. Whether beneath this variety of expression can be found any basic unity of view (e.g. with respect to the death of Jesus or of Christology) or not is a matter open to debate. There is, however, something to be said for the view that all of his statements concerning the death of Jesus presuppose a vicarious view, and that those concerning the nature of Christ presuppose a belief in Jesus as a transcendent Being. The details were worked out gradually, being elicited by individual situations, and (we believe) elaborated under the guidance of the Divine Spirit, as Paul was compelled to deal with the doctrinal and administrative problems of the Church. And his conclusions may well prove to be less inharmonious with the views of the primitive Church than some have supposed.

Concerning the Pastorals, and the Johannine and Petrine Epistles, it may be said that a minute dissection of them can be made which will render plausible the view that they represent the fabrication of a theology out of dim recollections or of second-hand traditions concerning Jesus. But it is possible that there may be found lying deeper beneath their surfaces a unity with the primitive tradition. Even if these writings were pseudepigraphic (which seems by no means a necessary conclusion), then the coincidence of general teaching is no less remarkable. The Pastorals, agrees Parsons, are written by one under the spell of Pauline influence;¹⁴ and the chief points of divergence from his thought and phraseology lie in the treatment of administrative problems. On the other hand, the Johannine Epistles concern themselves primarily with the refutation of the heresies which attacked those beliefs which were current from the times of the primitive Church. Hence, it may not be out of bounds to

¹² Scott, *op. cit.*, pp. 104ff.

¹³ Parsons, *op. cit.*, p. 86.

¹⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 233.

suggest that they presuppose the general tradition of the Church. That is, as Parsons suggests, such ideas as the pre-existence of Jesus and of His sonship are in harmony with those of the Pauline writings, the Fourth Gospel, and the Epistle to the Hebrews.¹⁵

The Epistle of James concerns itself with questions of exhortation and admonition—that is, with practical matters, and hence does not deal with many of the details which concern the writings just mentioned. *I Peter*, while covering a range of interests, gives chief concern to the question of the sufferings of Christ. It is clear that the writer is here concerned with the same problem that had engaged Paul and the writers of the Synoptics, namely, that of the significance of the death of Jesus.

The Epistle to the Hebrews approaches the religious question from a different angle, that of the *a fortiori* argument for the superiority of Christianity. Here interest in the saving work of Christ takes precedence over the question of Christology; and it may be asked whether the development of the soteriological element is or is not in harmony with that of, for example, Mark or Paul. The author of *Hebrews* has specialized in his field, and it is not therefore surprising that he carries the question of the death of Christ, in its setting of Jewish sacrificial structure, further than did the other writers. Scholars have not found it easy to decide whether his conclusions are parallel to, or divergent from, the views of the other writers. Their interpretations at this point seem to be governed largely by *a priori* considerations, as for example, their private views concerning the variety of the theology of the New Testament. Scott finds the Epistle to reflect a "changed attitude of mind" in the Church, and terms it "the first

manifesto of . . . Latin Christianity."¹⁶ Parsons finds *Hebrews* to express qualities more in harmony with those of the primitive Church.¹⁷

CONCLUSIONS

From the foregoing, several generalizations may be drawn, with respect to some of which much legitimate difference of opinion may exist.

1. That the New Testament is a collection of documents of great external variety. Historically, earnest and honest men have derived from them widely varying results and conclusions, as is witnessed by the rise of denominations and sects.

2. That the documents present at the same time great variety and (we believe) a significant unity. This unity centers in a belief that on the stage of human history, God appeared in the person of Jesus Christ.

3. That the life and character and work of this Jesus were so vast and significant than men, themselves spiritual giants, wrestled with the meaning of that Life.

4. That there was preserved a vigorous, and accurate tradition concerning the life of Jesus, which life had been marked by manifestations of a transcendent character.

5. That the early Christians attempted to interpret that Life in terms of their total impression of the Jesus in Whom they saw, dimly at first, God at work among men.

6. That in interpreting the Life of Jesus, these men were conditioned by profound experiences—personal experiences which they believed to have been conditioned in turn by the death and subsequent exaltation of Jesus.

7. That in developing its theology, the early Church was exercised by practical and administrative problems which elicited additional interest

¹⁵ *Op. cit.*, p. 247.

¹⁶ *Op. cit.*, pp. 236f.

¹⁷ *Op. cit.*, p. 142.

and spiritual search concerning the meaning of the life and person of its Founder.

8. That the diversities of personalities, plus the variety of circumstances calling forth these writings, resulted in expressions of belief which are to be read synthetically, rather than with a hostile and analytic temper. When so read, they represent the varied—and for this reason more attractive—expression of great central principles, adherence to which formed the doctrinal basis of the early Church.

9. That the element of unity in the early Church was more significant than the elements of variety.

10. That the progress of belief in the early Church was analogous to the personal progress of belief which oc-

curred, for instance, in the thought of St. Paul; hence the element of diversity in expression of the belief of the Church as a whole was no more surprising, nor no more indicative of a hit-and-miss procedure, than was the development of the theological thought of its great thinkers.

And finally,

11. That such a development was what might logically be expected in the growth of a movement of this kind; moreover, that it was the type of development which the Divine Spirit both could and would superintend. Out of the struggles of human thought, under His direction, was born a theology, not of dull monotony, but of sparkling variety, all pointing to One in whom God and man met.

Book Reviews

The Incarnation of the Word of God. St. Athanasius (being his treatise *De Incarnatione Verbi Dei*, newly translated into English by a religious of C. S. M. V., S. Th., with an introduction by C. S. Lewis). New York, The Macmillan Company, 1946. 95 pp. \$1.50.

"What think ye of Christ?" is a question which must be faced by every generation that has heard about Him. In the book under review we have the answer of one of the outstanding Nicene Fathers of the fourth century to this "most decisive and determinative question of history."

In a day when secular education is undergoing a radical revolution, as revealed by the newly proposed Harvard, Yale and Princeton Plans, it is also in order for the church to consider the need for a radical change in her Theological and Christian Education programs. The trend in secular education is to introduce the student to the classical literature of the centuries at first-hand rather than through more recent scholarly interpreters of that literature. C. S. Lewis hints that this would be a good procedure for the Christian to follow in his approach to the classical literature of the church.

In a delightfully written introduction to the book under review, C. S. Lewis, noted British lecturer and author, remarks that "There is a strange idea abroad that in every subject the ancient books should be read only by the professionals, and that the amateur should content himself with the modern books. . . . It has always therefore been one of my main endeavors as a teacher to persuade the young that first-hand knowledge is not only more worth acquiring than second-hand

knowledge, but is usually much easier and more delightful to acquire." (p. 5) Mr. Lewis reminds the reader that there is great danger in our time of "an exclusive contemporary diet" in reading which confines us too much to the outlook of our own age. "The only palliative is to keep the clean sea breeze of the centuries blowing through our minds, and this can be done only by reading old books." (p. 7) Especially is this the advice needed in the realm of theological literature.

Employing James Moffat's method, the Catholic Sister who translates this ancient book, simplifies, paraphrases and condenses some of the Greek sentences when it is in the interest of clarity and readability to do so. Here is theological literature of a very high order both for laymen, for whom it is in part designed, and for the clergy.

Following a brief but interesting sketch of St. Athanasius' life, the reader will find nine short chapters which were written by this ancient scholar to prove "that Christ is God, the Word and Power of God." St. Athanasius wrote this treatise, not as a polemic, but as a persuasive appeal to a young Christian convert named Macarius, whom he sought to establish in the Christian faith. With arguments and illustrations drawn from nature, reason and the Holy Scriptures, St. Athanasius leads his catechumen to consider the fall of man which has brought upon him guilt, corruption and mortality. Since repentance was an insufficient remedy for man's sin, the incarnation was necessary in order that God might reveal Himself to man and redeem man from sin and death. With penetrating in-

sights and cogent arguments St. Athanasius sets forth the meaning of the death of Christ which provided redemption from sin, and the significance of the resurrection of Christ which imparts power over death for the penitent believer in Christ.

To be sure, this book does not harmonize with the theological interpretations of either the present-day liberal or the neo-orthodox thinker, but both conservative Protestants and Catholics will find here the essence and central emphasis of a Biblical Christology. To the fully orthodox thinker there are phases of this treatise which will seem inadequate and slightly off-color for a well-developed doctrine of the person and work of Christ; but the primary emphasis upon the true humanity and supreme Deity of Jesus Christ, meeting in one Personality, is worthy of highest praise. This was St. Athanasius' faith, and he felt that he was speaking for the whole of the Christian Church at this crucial point of doctrine. Said St. Athanasius: "Here . . . is a brief statement of the faith of Christ and of the manifestation of His Godhead to us." (p. 95)

It is refreshing to read from a Christian writer who was not plagued with the contemporary necessity of confessing the weakness and failure of the Christian Church. St. Athanasius wrote from the perspective of one who was witnessing the triumphant march of Christianity across the ancient world, conquering in every nation the idolatries of the spirit, the cruelties of the flesh, and the philosophies of the mind, of mankind. He attributed this amazing success of the church to her faith in Jesus Christ as 'very God of very God' who had become incarnate in the flesh.

If this volume, the publication of which is something of an experiment, wins its way with the public, more of

the great Christian classics are promised in similar form.

DELBERT R. ROSE

Brightman's Reply to Gerstner—

In general, it is not considered "proper" to reply to a review. But when a person asks you questions, should you leave him agape and unanswered merely because he happens to be a reviewer? Not I, if I can help it.

Dr. Gerstner wrote in the Summer issue of *The Asbury Seminarian* a characteristically fair-minded, objective, and scholarly review of my volume *Nature and Values*. Since I value the review, and Dr. Gerstner, so highly, I have prepared the following answers to his questions.

1. "How can a person who has no abiding soul-substance identify himself as the same person from day to day?" *Answer*: The actual experience of self-identification and unity is the only abiding soul-substance we have or need. The person knows his identity by the facts of self-experience, memory, and anticipation. An additional, unexperienced scholastic substance would be empty of moral and spiritual values.

2. "If the mind can refer . . . to something beyond its idea why could this something . . . not be of a different stuff from personality?" *Answer*: In all philosophy there is a possible chance of error. I do not claim apodictic certainty. I claim only that any attempt to explain personality, or action on personality, by appeal to impersonal stuff is far less probable, less empirical, and less coherently rational, than the belief that mind alone creates mind and interacts with mind.

3. "How can Dr. Brightman honestly square his view of the supernatural with the traditional belief of the Methodist Church?" *Answer*:

Thank God, the traditional belief of Methodists includes John Wesley's: "If thy heart be as my heart, give me thy hand," and "Think and let think" (in nonessentials). My theory gives Spirit the control of nature, and makes God include both the natural and the supernatural. Methodists are not tied to any one metaphysics, either to idealism or to dualism. Methodists think and experience.

4. "Or any Christian symbol?" *Answer*: I suppose Dr. Gerstner means creed by symbol. If he asks whether I believe every item of any creed exactly as it was meant by its first writer, then I wonder how anyone can know that meaning with certainty or whether any Christian of today puts exactly the original meaning on very many credal statements. But if a creed is a symbol of Christian experience, I can assert that I believe fully in the reality and validity of the experiences on which the symbols are founded. But I can't let the Council of Nicaea do all my thinking for me.

5. "Because nature is known through consciousness, is ordered and purposive, are we justified in the conclusion that it is therefore of the nature of mind?" *Answers* I certainly deny that the nature of knowledge alone can prove the nature of the object. Order and purpose are signs of mind; and there are many other idealistic arguments. To invent an unexperienced kind of reality, other than consciousness, as the basis of nature is to raise questions as to how it can act on mind, produce sensations and conform to rational law. In fact, dualism is a compromise with materialism which really grants a large part of the materialist's argument. See also no. 2 above.

6. "Can you say there is no mind in our bodies because we cannot find it with our senses (p. 124)?" *Answer*: I define body as what can be perceived

by sense. If there is any better definition, let's have it. I hope it is clear that mind cannot be found within or as a part of what is perceived by sense. There is, indeed, no mind in our body. Mind cannot be located in brain or out of it. It is not in space; all space is experience in mind. No part of my body is my mind; no part of my mind is any part of my body. The interaction between my mind and my body is, I think, one instance of direct interaction between my mind and God's mind.

7. "Can we find our consciousness which is believed to be 'in' our body?" *Answer*: Consciousness is the only thing we can ever find directly and immediately. We experience our consciousness at all times when we have any experience at all. To say that our consciousness, say, of the Milky Way, or of the square root of -1 , or of God, is anywhere in our body, seems to me utterly unempirical and unreasonable. We *experience* consciousness; we *believe* in body. If we believe coherently in personalism, we believe that body is God acting on, sustaining, and constantly creating our personality, with its powers, including freedom.

EDGAR S. BRIGHTMAN

NOTE:

The Asbury Seminarian is glad to print this reply, inasmuch as Dr. Gerstner's review raised specific questions. It may be observed that the oft-quoted statement of John Wesley, "If thy heart be as my heart, give me thy hand." is capable of indefinite extension. It would be interesting to know whether Wesley, if he were living today, would be as latitudinarian as some would like to imagine. Wesley was tolerant only with reference to *non necessitas*—to diverse contemporary attempts to state the Christian faith; but he was by no means tolerant of distinct departures from historic Christianity such as Dr. Brightman's philosophy seems to be.

EDITOR

Christianity Rightly So Called, by Samuel G. Craig. Philadelphia: Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Company, 1946. x, 270 pages. \$2.00.

That the last word concerning the nature of Christianity has not been said is evidenced by the appearance of another volume which seeks to answer the question, What is Christianity? In his *Foreword* Dr. Craig indicates his purpose: "The aim of this book is to distinguish between Christianity and its counterfeits in a manner understandable by the man in the pew as well as the man in the pulpit. Its purpose is exposition, not defense, and exposition only in as far as needed to make clear what Christianity rightly so called is in distinction from what is wrongly so called." In the main the author has succeeded in keeping to his purpose; at some points defense has been the major part of exposition.

The heart of the volume, by admission of the author, is the chapter entitled "The Essential Content of Christianity." In thirty-six pages he succeeds in summarizing the basic principles of historic Christian belief, emphasizing primarily the rôle of Christ in the system bearing His name. It goes without saying that this chapter will mean much more to those of us who accept the New Testament as normative than to those who seek a norm elsewhere.

Dr. Craig is allergic to Lessing's dictum to the effect that "accidental truths of history can never be the proof of necessary truths of reason." Conservative Christians may well ponder his chapter "Christianity, Facts and Doctrines" in which he clarifies the question of the relation of authority to Christian faith. Craig is a

worthy successor to J. Gresham Machen at the point of his insistence upon a hard core of *content* in the Christian Gospel.

Other chapters deal with such subjects as the definitions of Christianity proposed by recent scholarship, the relationship of the Christian system to history, the ethical implications of the Gospel, the historic Christian attitude toward the Bible, modern variants of Christianity, and the finality of the Christian faith. Each of these subjects is treated from a frankly conservative point of view. Some may feel that Dr. Craig adopts an *ex cathedra* manner, notably in his chapter "Deformations and Falsifications of Christianity." In the opinion of this reviewer however, even at those points in which the author is firmly dogmatic, he manifests a spirit which adorns the office of the apologist. Let it be said also, that while the author is of the Calvinistic persuasion, he is more than usually successful in dealing fairly with the Arminian position. His chief divergence from Arminianism is evident at the point of the degree to which the Holy Spirit may operate in a sanctifying manner during the life of the Christian.

Finally, he avoids the tendency to define Christianity in terms of some highly distilled essence, or some neat formula of epigrammatic character. He frankly acknowledges that, in its elaboration, Christianity is by no means a simple and general phenomenon, but that it has a rationale which involves both breadth and depth of content. This, coupled with the fact that the author writes in a stimulating and delightful style, ought to commend the volume to a wide range of readers.

HAROLD B. KUHN

Remaking the Modern Mind, by Carl F. H. Henry. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans: 1946. 310 pages. \$3.00.

The twentieth century has had its fling at producing non-Christian answers to the basic problems with which man is confronted, and conservative religious philosophy has only recently ventured to re-assert the essentially Christian view of God, of man, of nature, and of the universe. Professor Henry of Northern Baptist Theological Seminary, has made a heartening contribution to a Christian apologetic, and from a vantage point which is almost as contemporary as today's newspaper.

The central thesis of the volume is that the period 1914-1945 marks the end of an age, an epoch which was governed by a general pattern of premises which are today discredited by the realities of the judgment upon Western culture. The presuppositions under fire are declared to be especially the following:

- (1) The inevitability of human progress;
- (2) The inherent goodness of man;
- (3) The ultimate reality of nature;
- (4) The ultimate animality of man.

Chapters II, III, IV, and V contain a discerning analysis of the tyranny which the first three of these have exercised over the modern mind. The author is frankly committed to the positions of historic Christianity, and thus finds himself able to present the criticisms of modern life which such thinkers as Reinhold Niebuhr bring forward, in a frame of reference free from the unorthodox trappings of the Crisis Theology.

Welcome is Dr. Henry's observation at the point of the vitalism of Bergson, Morgan, and Alexander, which he considers to be a compromise between "the cardinal tenets of the past 350 years of speculative thought, and the complete relevance of the Hebrew-

Christian tradition." (Page 167.) Some of us are in hearty agreement with him in the conclusion that emergent evolution, and its related philosophy of personal idealism, are the most likely rivals of historic Christianity, representing yet a surrender of that which is truly basic to the Christian system. Chapter VI, under title of "A Criticism of the Theory of Levels" is a *must* for the student who desires to understand the basic principles of so-called creative evolution, and who lacks time to make a thorough canvass of the literature elaborating it. Equally stimulating is the chapter entitled "The Predicament of Modern Gods" in which the limitations of the gods of classical Greek paganism are shown to be paralleled by the impotence of the 'gods' of the moderns, whether of the subjectivists, the vitalists, the personal idealists or the absolute idealists.

It may seem by now that our author has entered the lists with a formidable group of opponents. Sometimes he gives the impression, even to the reader of kindred heart-beat, that he has spread himself too widely. Nevertheless Professor Henry has seized accurately the rather intangible thing called the *Zeitgeist* of our age, and treads with confident step in his assertion of the disjunction existing between that spirit and the Judeo-Christian way of thinking. This same type of plain dealing is manifest in the discussion of the ethical dilemma of the modern mind. Here our author locates our difficulty, in large part, in the lack of moral absolutes, and especially of norms grounded in an absolute and supernatural Person. Contemporary non-revelatory ethics, even in its better forms, is without the dynamic furnished by supernatural regeneration, and must fall back upon the doubtful dynamic inherent in its own philosophical position. All this is traced to the repudiation by the modern mind of

the essentials of the Hebrew-Christian position.

The concluding chapter, "Remaking the Modern Mind," deals with the problem of the anti-intellectualism which promises to grip an era which has found its confidence shaken to the point that it must reject many of its dogmas, but which has formed such intellectual habits as forbid the forthright abandonment of the lame metaphysics out of which these dogmas have come. It is probable that at this point Dr. Henry has the dialectical theologians primarily in mind; professing faith in such views as the essential sinfulness of man, and repudiating the dogma of necessary progress, they yet retain allegiance to principles which militate against a thorough faith in the only source of a really alternate mode of thinking, namely in the Christian Scriptures.

At some points in the volume, Dr. Henry seems more confident than some of us that high intellectual circles really recognize the bankruptcy of the initial premises which have produced the modern mind. One wonders whether, in some circles at least, the commitment of scholarship to the basic 'modern' dogmas may not be so deep that for some years a reversal of intellectual gears will be impossible—and that at least in America the devotees of 'modernity' will be compelled, in order to fave face, to maintain these commitments with a 'do-or-die' persistence.

Welcome is the re-assertion by our author of the relevance of the historic Christian faith to the crisis of the hour. A thoughtful study of *Remaking the Modern Mind* will give courage as well as information to the person who desires to understand something of the underlying causes of the sickness of the modern world.

HAROLD B. KUHN.

The Great Divorce, by Clive Staples Lewis. New York, Macmillan, 1946. 133 pages, \$1.50.

In this little volume, Mr. Clive Staples Lewis, the don of Oxford, has given us another brilliant and absorbing fantasy. He describes with clarity and wit an imaginary journey from Hell to Heaven.

To understand the story the reader must continually keep in mind two things which the author mentions in his preface. First, "attempts to marry hell and heaven are perennial," he says. "The attempt is based on the belief that reality never presents us with an absolutely unavoidable 'either-or'; that, granted skill and patience and (above all) time enough some way of embracing both alternatives can always be found; that mere development or adjustment or refinement will somehow turn evil into good without our being called on for a final and total rejection of anything we should like to retain." "This belief," he continues, "I take to be a disastrous error." . . . "If we insist on keeping hell (or even earth) we shall not see Heaven: if we accept Heaven, we shall not be able to retain even the smallest and most intimate souvenirs of Hell." The second thing is to remember that the story is a fantasy. "The transmortal conditions (described) are solely an imaginative supposal: they are not even a guess or a speculation at what may actually await us."

The story begins with a description of a group of people awaiting the arrival of a bus. Anyone in the "Grey City—the city of shadows" may take the excursion to the outskirts of Heaven. Some were going for a definite purpose, such as the theologian who found no one in the grey city with whom he could argue or discuss the subjects in which he was interested. Then there was the woman who wanted God to return the son he had taken from her

Others were going to see if this was just another racket. Still others were going for the ride.

When the group arrived, the narrator discovered that all were transparent ghosts. Each ghost eventually encountered someone—a bright shining individual,—a Spirit—who answered his questions and tried to assist him in making right decisions. Some of the Spirits were former acquaintances whom the Ghosts felt had not been especially saintly while on earth and, therefore, resented their well meaning assistance. Despite the continued and skilful leading of the Spirits, all but one of the newcomers returned to the bus and to the shadows from whence they came. Being free to make their choice, they were unwilling to give up petty jealousies and various sins, preferring rather to continue as they were.

One Ghost rode off on his beautiful white steed to the hills where God was waiting, but only after he consented to have his sin "burned out" and after that process had been completed. The narrator, after witnessing the struggle between self and the tempter, was told by his Spirit Teacher that "nothing, not even the best and noblest, can go on as it now is." It must be purified.

Mr. Lewis has presented this great spiritual truth in popular form. His rare gift for character analysis, his wise choice of suitable words combined with his ability to intersperse the serious with humor, makes this story fascinatingly readable.

There may be some readers who will object to the implication of the "time" and "place" of purification. Most readers, however, will agree that Heaven and Hell must be completely divorced and that the process of purification is a necessary prerequisite to entering the Eternal City.

LENA B. NOFCIER

Religion in America, by Willard L. Sperry. New York: Macmillan, 1946. xi, 318 pp. \$2.50.

Religion in America, a book of more than 300 pages, was written to interpret certain American institutions to the English public. The author, who is the dean of Harvard Divinity School, warns us that the book is not designed to be either a history, a theology, a sociology or an apologetic; but the reader will find the book to be an engaging amalgam of all these.

The author's aim is to tell the British people some very pertinent things about ourselves. He uses an informal and chatty style which is refreshing indeed. One gets the feeling that here are the matured reflections of deep and reverent scholarship, gleaned from the vantage point of one of the significant centers of the American scene. The author is an avowed liberal, yet he condemns the ultimate of the liberal position; in fact, he is almost as much displeased with that as he is with the "somber and pessimistic" position of the conservatives.

The introductory chapter indicates the points at which our religious life differs from that of England. There are twelve chapters, dealing with such topics as religion in the Thirteen Colonies, The Denominations (of which there are 256), American Theology, Religious Education, Negro Churches, Catholicism, etc.

The readers of this review will appreciate some random samplings of the book to show its spicy, penetrating insight. In characterizing us Americans, the author says we are "predominantly sons of Martha." Our Protestantism is much engaged in "doing good," "more especially that sort of good that involves 'going about,' preferably in Pullman cars—"

In appraising the theological position he makes this observation: "Our

immediate theological position is this; our most vocal theologians . . . are either at the humanist left or at the neo-orthodox right." He sees a great middle group who are perplexed and inarticulate. He believes this middle group may find its voice and achieve a compromise. He cuts to the heart of the matter with this: "The idea of religion presupposes the paradox of God and man met in one experience." "Neither the absolute sovereignty of God (neo-orthodoxy) nor the final self-sufficiency of man (humanism) preserve that which the idea of religion requires." On the basis of this the author might be branded as a synergist and claimed for Arminianism.

On human nature he says, "Patently human nature in its totality is, at the moment, very far from giving a letter-perfect vindication of liberalism." He says the biological sciences have never taken a "blandly cheerful view of human nature." "If not Adam, then the ape and the tiger live on in us."

Discussing the small sects which make much of the prophetic books of the Bible, he says, "Let it be said in defense of these people that contemporary history seems to be on their side rather than on the side of those of us who are heirs of an old-fashioned, upgrade, omnibus liberalism."

He analyzes the educational situation in this discerning fashion: "We have in America the curious paradox of denominational colleges soft-pedaling their religious traditions in an attempt to be cosmopolitan (thus forfeiting denominational support), and the state universities providing means for the cultivation of the religious life and maintenance of religious habits, which is no part of their concern."

The book is fascinating, stimulating and informative. Religious leaders could read it with profit. The author has no axe to grind nor anything to

sell, so he is uninhibited in his appraisals. He definitely does not like fundamentalism. One gets the idea that it is old supra-lapsarian Calvinistic fundamentalism that he opposes. On the other hand he is frank in charging liberalism with moral bankruptcy. He thinks there should be a middle way. Perhaps the hour is golden for Arminians or Essentialists to begin to advertise their wares.

WILDER R. REYNOLDS

The New Modernism, by Cornelius Van Til. Philadelphia: Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Co., 1946. xx, 384 pp. \$3.75.

The content of this volume is indicated more fully in its sub-title, *An Appraisal of the Theology of Barth and Brunner*. Professor Van Til's thesis is, that Barth and Brunner differ radically from orthodox Protestantism at every significant point of doctrine, so that while their theology is ostensibly a protest against modern theological liberalism, it is in reality Modernism in a new guise.

The first 187 pages are devoted to a critical analysis of the earlier phase of the Dialectical Theology, as developed by Barth and Brunner in agreement. This section, which is by no means easy reading, gives especial consideration to the common indebtedness of the crisis theologians and modern liberal theologians, to the critical epistemology of Kant. Our author sees both movements as grounded in the 'idea of the autonomous man.'

Professor Van Til traces the Dialectical Theology to five sources, namely: Kant's critical philosophy, Hegel's dialecticism, Kierkegaard's existential dialecticism, the motif of 'primal history' as developed by Overbeck, and the *Existenz* philosophy of Heidegger. These same ingredients are held to enter into the structure of modern liber-

alism. Both movements are then charged with being positivistic and naturalistic. The crisis theology of Barth and Brunner, ostensibly conservative, is portrayed as having for its chief foe historic Christianity.

At root, the "new orthodoxy" seems to be no orthodoxy at all. Its interpretation of the doctrines of God, creation, fall of man, sin, redemption and future things are fundamentally opposed to the classical Protestant conceptions. The treatment of this question is carefully done, and represents a thorough canvass of the maze of paradoxical statements employed by Barth.

The second division of the volume deals with the differences between Barth and Brunner, and embraces pages 188-274. The chief contribution of this section is the careful comparison by the author of the two writers at the points of the nature of God, the nature of human responsibility, and Brunner's doctrine of personal correspondence. Dr. Van Til discovers again that while the theologians under question seem to consider the consciousness theology of Schleiermacher as Enemy No. 1, in reality they rehabilitate modern immanentism.

The third section, pages 275 to the end, deals with the contrast between the dialectical notions of the Christian church, the Christian life, and the Christian hope on the one hand, and the Reformed views at these same points. The reader will notice that the author's treatment of these subjects is from the point of view of high Calvinism. He considers the doctrine of a self-contained God and an ontological trinity to be the truly Christian view and infers that this doctrine is the exclusive property of Calvinism—Professor Van Til might be surprised to

learn that this view is held by many Arminians!

The real question posed by the volume is that of the essential dependence of Barth and Brunner upon the critical philosophy. Some will contend that Barth grounds his biblicism upon philosophical skepticism, and that his use of the canons of modern criticism has for its purpose merely the establishment of this skepticism. If this were true, then Dr. Van Til has misunderstood his opponents. This reviewer is of the opinion, however, that the author is correct in his contention that modern phenomenism is basic to the Dialectical Theology, all along the line.

It is hoped that enough has been said to indicate that this volume is a *must* for the person who would understand the nature of the 'new supernaturalism.' The author might, without weakening his own case, give credit to the crisis theologians for their positive achievements, such as the renewal of emphasis, in high circles, upon sin as pride instead of sensuality, and upon eschatology, even if in attenuated form. Nevertheless, Professor Van Til has rendered the cause of orthodoxy a large service in drawing attention to the deeper implications of the Dialectical Theology, and to its basic kinship with the very system against which it inveighs.

Many will dismiss the book as expressing a domestic quarrel within the conservative household. To the reviewer this seems a superficial objection. While some elements in the theology of crisis seem to be conservative in tendency, the author has made a strong case for the view that the system is a blood-cousin to modern liberalism—that it is in reality only a New Modernism.

HAROLD B. KUHN

Plato's Theory of Man, An Introduction to the Realistic Philosophy of Culture, by John Wild; Cambridge, Harvard University Press, 1946. x, 320 pp. \$5.00.

Professor Wild has produced one of the outstanding books of the year. He has accomplished fully the difficult task of combining a profound analysis of human culture, its components and structure and the perennial problems it must face, with a vivid study of the practical philosophy of Plato.

As a study of Plato this book stands among those of the best recent scholars, such as F. M. Cornford, Raphael Demos, Werner Jaeger in *Paideia*, and the late A. E. Taylor. It is inferior to none of them, and conspicuously stronger than some, in point of the magic of insight that sees beneath the obvious tenets of Plato (e.g. the Ideas and immortality) to the more basic theses which start from practical life, orienting it in its full setting of the various metaphysical levels and unveiling the critical choices that direct its flow. This approach is true to the historical Plato. He was at bottom the practical philosopher, exercised by the issues of life in a dissolving democracy and seeking the roots of collapse and restoration in the inversion and conversion of the individual soul and of the encompassing group. Though Plato's argument for the unity of the virtues under intelligent decision (in the *Protagoras*) is a fallacy on the conceptual plane, it is sound and cogent on the level of practice. The living individual, aspiring toward his end, responds to the action-situation in such wise that, unless directed by clear insight, he slips down toward vice. Plato's marvelous moving images of the soul as the chariot-driver with his steeds (*Phaedrus*), of education as turning about and climbing out of the cave, and of society as a ship (*Republic*) requiring the art of navigation and firm helmsmanship in

order to avoid the rocks and weather storms, are evidences of his practical concern and vital insight into practice. Life is process, and the issue is direction.

Professor Wild's analysis of certain great dialogues lays bare the mutual interweaving of metaphysical truth and cultural sanity. His case is unusually strong concerning the strict interpretation of Plato's ontology. Much is gained by his joining Cornford to repudiate the popular tendency to consider the *Parmenides*, Plato's most baffling work, as a mere exercise or even as a joke. It is time to appreciate the correlation between the cave and divided line in the *Republic* and the intricate dialectic of the second part of the *Parmenides*. Both passages investigate the levels of being, says Wild, from the flowing, relative being of subjective fantasy, through the partially stable structure of the changing world as seen by common experience and the permanent formal order of science, to the perfection of pure Being, the cause and end of all. Again, Wild shows convincingly that the ontology of the *Parmenides* and *Sophist* bring Plato close to Aristotle's realistic vision of the dynamic world whose individual substances interact in a manner requiring analysis by the four types of causal determinant. In fact, Plato's first hints of such analysis appear early in his scattered accounts of man's arts or crafts—the craftsman makes his product by imposing structure on a piece of matter for an end. Here we note Plato's practical interest coming back in force. The *Theatetus* and *Sophist* show that inversion of the order of being necessitates inversion of human culture. Consider the arts, both singly and together. Each is rational action on matter for an end. Together they constitute a proper hierarchy, one using the product of another for a higher and ruling end; the higher

art legitimately dominates the efforts of a lower. The scale is topped by religion, philosophy, and the special sciences; education receives insight from above and then dominates politics, which in turn provides the order essential to the lower arts and makes safe the peace and material sufficiency which are conditions for the kingly arts and for the life that is good for man. Turn this right order upside down, however, and the lower arts dictate to the superior. Then culture is inverted and society is on the road to materialism. Life is distracted by quack doctors and educators, the end of social cooperation is degraded to the production of more and more external goods, the state divides into factions, and spurious arts breed freely—demagoguery in place of political leadership, propaganda for objective education, “scientism” and sophistry for philosophy, pragmatic techniques in place of intelligent practice. This trend is the essence of materialism; and there is no end of the road but brutal totalitarianism devoted to bald outward goods and to unlimited increase of brute power. Then all are slaves; most of us to a few of us, all to fake values blindly mistaken for the real goal of life.

Despite his brilliant penetration, Wild seems to falter now and then. Quite often the reader desires interpretation and defense of Plato's views, not only exposition. One passage deals with the philosopher's power to descend the ladder of knowledge with greater certainty than that with which he came up. Is it possible to “prove” the assumptions of the sciences by

means of the more intelligible truths on a higher stratum of being? Another Platonic insight that needs a commentary and defense is the conception of the significance of myths, i.e. of the relation of religion to rational investigation. Again, while Wild reports Plato's growing awareness of the reality of life and soul and suggests the argument for God to which it leads, he might have stated the argument fully and exhibited its claim to cogency. Sometimes Wild points out a mistake of Plato; but he fails to test the tendency to treat the individual chiefly in terms of his craft or art. On this account the book is slightly fuzzy on the issue of democracy. It states uncritically the dogma of Plato that the crowd is essentially ignorant and fractious (Aristotle is less hasty here), and asserts that the ideal state of the Republic is a “classless society.” These matters need rethinking. Finally, I would like to see the doctrines of the *Timæus* and *Laws* interpreted in the light of what Wild takes to be Plato's “Aristotelian” ontology.

I conclude with a tribute to the author. We should be grateful for his book. The great classical tradition, running down from Plato into the late Middle Ages, is the sanest and broadest philosophy the West has known. Many of our modern movements are eccentric by comparison. Professor Wild works brilliantly to remind us of our tradition and to stir us to learn from it. For this task he has hardly an equal in America today.

JESSE DE BOER



Asbury Theological Seminary

Wilmore, Kentucky

— *An Accredited Member of the American Association of Theological Schools* —

J. C. McPHEETERS, D.D., LL.D., *President*

B. JOSEPH MARTIN, M.Th., Ph.D., *Vice-President*

W. D. TURKINGTON, M.A., B.D., D.D., *Dean*

- ★ **A GROWING SEMINARY** — with an enrollment of 187 students in Fall Quarter; an increase of 27 per cent over the enrollment of last fall.
- ★ **A COSMOPOLITAN SEMINARY** — with a student body representing 41 colleges, and coming from 31 states and 3 foreign countries.
- ★ **AN INTERDENOMINATIONAL SEMINARY** — with 17 denominations represented in the student body.
- ★ **THE AIM** of Asbury Theological Seminary is to prepare a well-trained, Spirit-filled, evangelistic ministry, under the influence of a scholarly, consecrated faculty.
- ★ **DEGREES OFFERED** — Bachelor of Divinity and Master of Religious Education.

A \$100.00 SCHOLARSHIP PROVIDED FOR
EACH QUALIFYING STUDENT

WINTER QUARTER REGISTRATION: JANUARY 1, 1947



